

AMERICA
NATION OR CONFUSION

EDWARD R. LEWIS

Library
of



Oglethorpe College



Philip Weltner Library
Atlanta, Georgia



AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

AMERICA NATION OR CONFUSION

A STUDY OF OUR
IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS

BY
EDWARD R. LEWIS



Philip Weltner Library
Atlanta, Georgia

PUBLISHERS
HARPER & BROTHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
MCMXXVIII

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION
COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY EDWARD R. LEWIS
PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

FIRST EDITION

A-C



Philip Weltner Library

Atlanta, Georgia

To My FATHER
WHO IN HIS LIFE AND TEACHING
HAS BEEN EVER TRUE TO THE GREAT
TRADITION OF AMERICA

128103

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD	xi
PREFACE	xiii
I. THE NATURE AND PURPOSES OF THE IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS	
1. Sketch of Immigration Legislation	1
2. Motive of the Quota Legislation	8
3. Plan of the Book	14
II. THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR	
1. Nature and Scope of the Demand	16
2. Much Shortage is Sectional and Seasonal	23
3. Always a Shortage	25
4. An Endless Demand for Cheap Labor	30
5. Hands and Not Citizens	35
6. Will Americans Do Common Labor?	38
7. Immigration Does Not Increase the Labor Supply	49
8. Summary	51
III. THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION	
1. The Demand for Individual Selection and the Claim of Discrimination	54
2. The Case of Noted Individuals	68
3. The Literacy Test and Individual Selection	71
4. No Selective Tests Are Suggested	76
5. Present Tests Inadequate	78
6. Selection Breaks Down Under the Pressure of Numbers	81
IV. RESTRICTION AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK	
1. Reduction in Numbers the Main Motive	88
2. The Reason for Reducing Numbers—The Threatened Submergence of Our Colonial Stock	89
3. The Limit of Population	106
4. Should We Allow the Old Stock to be Submerged?	110

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

PAGE

V. THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

1. The Old Ideal of the Melting-Pot of Races 114
2. No Question of Racial Superiority 122
3. Doubts as to the Racial Melting-Pot 123

VI. THE MELTING-POT OF INSTITUTIONS AND CUSTOMS.

WHAT IS A NATION?

1. The Old Ideal of the Melting-Pot of Institutions 131
2. What Makes a Nation? 139
3. A Nation Comes from the Past 143
4. The Attack on Tradition—Ideals for the Future versus
Ideals from the Past 150

VII. THE MAKING OF NATIONS

1. The Making of France 167
2. The Making of England 180
3. The Failure of Nations Where Homogeneity is Absent 184
4. The Making of America and the Melting-Pot's Contribution 188

VIII. THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT—THE TEST OF THE WAR

1. The Growth of Alien Groups 205
2. The German-Americans and the War 212

IX. THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT—THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE IRISH REPUBLIC 257

X. THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT—ALIEN GROUPS IN POST WAR POLITICS

1. The Newer Alien Groups 288
2. Alien Groups and the League 290
3. Alien Groups and the Four Power Treaty, the World Court
and the Quota Laws 295
4. Fascism in America 305
5. The War Debts 307
6. Chicago Politics 308
7. Summary—The Extent of Political Confusion 313

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY	
1. Opposing Ideals—The Attack on the Unified Nation . . .	319
2. Possible Effects on our Political Capacity	332
3. Racial Diversity Endangers our Social Harmony and our Intellectual Development	335
(a) The Schools	336
(b) Diverse Religions and Their Results	352
(c) Jewish Isolation	369
(d) The Effect of Racial Heterogeneity on Law	370
(e) Heterogeneity and Literature	373
XII. CONCLUSION	
1. The Extent of the Disintegration	380
2. The Act of 1924 as a Remedy	382
3. The National Origins Plan of Restriction	384
4. The Attack on the Origins Plan	387
5. The Alternative	400
6. Conclusion	405



FOREWORD

I WISH to express my deep thanks for criticisms and encouragement in the preparation of this book, above all to John B. Trevor of New York City, Francis H. Kinnicutt and Madison Grant of the New York Bar, whose generous aid I can never repay, and also to Kenneth L. Roberts of Kennebunk Beach, Maine, Norman S. Parker and Victor A. Remy of the Chicago Bar, Elias Lyman of Evanston, Illinois, Edmund H. Eitel of Highland Park, Illinois, my brother, Charles S. Lewis, Jr., and my father, Charles S. Lewis, who have all read the manuscript or the proofs and have given me many valuable suggestions and criticisms and greatly stimulated me in carrying on the work. My wife has greatly helped me with the proofs.

Of course, none of the above persons are responsible for any of the opinions in the book or for any of its defects or errors.

EDWARD R. LEWIS

HUBBARD WOODS, ILLINOIS
January, 1928

P R E F A C E

IT may seem necessary to explain why it is desirable to add another book on the immigration question, particularly when the Act of 1924 seems to become every day more firmly established as the policy of the country. Many of us, indeed, have been surprised at the power of the sentiment behind the Johnson Act. Much as some of us may have desired it and believe in it, its vitality, in the face of the enormous pressure of the old sentiments and the economic interests in favor of free immigration, has been a matter of genuine surprise. But we must not deceive ourselves with its apparent strength. In the first place, it has had powerful, adventitious aids. To mention one only, the outcry of employers for common labor has been measurably diminished by the fact that the law allows Mexicans to enter without restriction by the quota law. Moreover, there has been much illicit immigration. The pressure has been diminished from the rear. Yet the Mexican is a more unassimilable alien, perhaps, than any from southern or eastern Europe. We cannot call the quota law established until it applies to Mexico, Central and South America as well as to Europe and Asia. Until this is achieved, it is still an experimental policy.

Moreover, there is reason to believe that at present the opinion against free immigration is at its height

PREFACE

and that the inevitable reaction will give far greater power to the advocates of free immigration. The war undoubtedly stimulated national feeling and the desire for unity, and as the war recedes from view the impulse for solidarity will tend to grow weaker. In the last session of Congress as many as 20 bills were introduced proposing to modify, many of them seriously, the Act of 1924. One bill alone, the Wadsworth bill, designed to admit the relatives of immigrants already here, would have admitted to the United States, according to the estimates of the Secretary of State, no less than 577,000 aliens from Europe alone. All of these bills, save that which most properly opened the doors to former service men of the World War, were defeated. But the pressure is there and it will continue. Indeed, Senator Wagner of New York made one of the issues of his campaign the liberalization of our immigration laws, and since his election has declared that he will work as Senator to that end.¹

We must realize, also, that the final basis of the Act of 1924 is still in the balance. The law provided that by April 1, 1927, the President should put all quotas on the national origins basis, that is, fix the quota of each nation on the percentage which those living here in 1920 whose ancestors originated in that particular country bear to the total population of the country. The present basis is the percentage which those born in that country, living here in 1890, bore to the total foreign-born living here in 1890. Bitter

¹ *New York Times*, Nov. 4, 1926.

PREFACE

opposition to the national origins provision developed in the recent session of Congress. A joint resolution was adopted last winter postponing the promulgation of the national origins quotas until July 1, 1928. The national origins provision is therefore now directly at stake, and those who believe in it have an urgent duty to argue their case to the American public. This provision, in my opinion, is a very important and desirable element in the whole quota principle and may become essential to its continued maintenance.

I believe, too, that this book treats the question with a somewhat different emphasis from previous books in defense of immigration restriction. It attempts to prove that immigrants of diverse races, if allowed to come in such numbers that they will remain for two or three generations alien groups in our midst, if they come, that is, as groups and not as individuals, will, however worthy they may be individually, in time destroy our oneness, our like-mindedness, blur and perhaps in time destroy our unified national tradition. The physical or racial results of the mixture of alien races with our native stock are barely alluded to. The question is considered from the standpoint of the possible loss of our political and social unity.

Finally, even if the present quota law were certain to maintain its position, I believe that the argument presented in this book has its justification in the need for an interpretation of that law. The law has been bitterly condemned by many idealistic persons as un-

PREFACE

just, discriminatory, even as an insult to worthy Americans of recent arrival. I do not believe that it is unjust, or in any way an insult, and I believe that it is highly desirable to attempt to show the true basis on which it rests. This I try to do in this book.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE AND PURPOSES OF THE IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

I. SKETCH OF IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

THE war forced upon us a consideration of the essentials of life. As individuals we were forced to consider the meaning of our lives and our duty to our country. As citizens of our country we were forced to examine the nature of our country, its origin, its ideals, and, in no grandiloquent sense, its destiny. The war forced an abandonment of all our normal pursuits and ways of thought, and brought us hard up against the old, stark realities. The present knocked imperatively and would not be denied. It also sounded the depths of our past. Our ancestral origins called to us. Even headlong, young, impatient America hearkened to the voice of her past. Her new aliens who had no past in this country naturally hearkened to their own past. The subtle call of racial origins would not be denied. The war made us all race conscious as we had never been before. In Europe men ceased to be Socialists and became Germans, Frenchmen and Belgians. Since the war, this preoccupation in race has not died out. We have had much investigation of racial origins and characteristics, some of it amateurish and extravagant. But twenty years ago we did not have it at all.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Twenty years ago we thought, most of us, that all healthy immigrants were equally fit as potential Americans. Some of us think so still. But a great number of us, perhaps a majority, now have a definite feeling that a certain degree of racial unity is necessary to a nation. We have not only tried to limit the number of immigrants who can come to this country, but we have deliberately and avowedly limited the numbers on the basis of their racial origins.

Up to 1921, there had been no discrimination between white immigrants on the ground of race. Indeed, until 1890, there had been little demand for any legislation restricting immigration. While the Know-Nothing movement acquired real power, it resulted in no legislation. Until 1876, the states actually legislated in regard to immigration. The Federal policy was distinctly favorable. In 1864 Congress even passed a law designed to aid the entrance of foreign contract labor. This was repealed in 1868. In 1882 a head tax of fifty cents was levied, and those convicted of crimes other than political, lunatics, insane, and persons likely to become a public charge were excluded. In 1891, 1903, and 1907, polygamists, persons suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease, imbeciles, and the feeble-minded, and persons mentally or physically defective so as to affect their ability to earn a living, were added to the list of those excluded.

The act of 1917 repealed all prior acts and consolidated all former provisions into one law. A head tax of eight dollars was imposed. Feeble-minded,

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

the insane, those mentally or physically diseased or defective, contract laborers, persons likely to become a public charge, criminals, polygamists, anarchists, or immoral persons, were the main classes excluded.

Absolute exclusion was first applied to the Chinese. In 1882 the first Chinese Exclusion Act was passed and it has been renewed from time to time and is still in force.

In 1907 Theodore Roosevelt made the famous gentlemen's agreement by which Japan agreed to grant her passports only to non-laborers, or only to those laborers who were former residents or relatives or to settled agriculturists.

The first serious attempt to limit the number of white immigrants was the literacy test. Cleveland vetoed a literacy test bill in 1896, Taft another in 1910, Wilson one in 1915 and another in 1917. This last was passed over his veto. The literacy test, as we shall see, was primarily designed to reduce numbers and numbers from southern and eastern Europe. But even under these proposals, all immigrants applying for admission were treated alike. Then in 1921 the first quota law was passed. It was a temporary measure. But in it were the germs of the Act of 1924. The Act of 1921 limited the immigration in any one year to 3% of our foreign-born population in 1910, or to 357,803, and that from any particular country to 3% of the persons born in that country living here in 1910. Persons who had lived three years in any of the countries of North, South or Central America were excluded from the quota.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The total admissible in any year under the Act of 1921 from southern and eastern Europe was 159,008, or 43% of the total quota immigration allowed by the Act. In 1920 the percentage of European immigration admitted from southern and eastern Europe was 64% and in 1921, although one month was subject to the quota act of 1921, it was 78%.

The Act of 1921 was continued from year to year until the Act of 1924 was passed. That Act, like that of 1921, divided immigrants into two classes, quota and non-quota. Immigration of persons born in Mexico, Canada, Central and South America is non-quota immigration and can come into the United States without limit of numbers, subject only to individual examination as to health, sanity, pauperism, crimes, and anarchistic beliefs. All other immigration is quota immigration. It fixed the limit of quota immigration at 2% of the foreign-born from quota countries living here in 1890. This amount is 164,667 a year. Each country was allowed each year 2% of the number of persons born in that country living here in 1890.

But the 1890 basis was intended to be only temporary. The Act of 1924 provided that by 1927 quotas should be based on the percentage by national origins of the entire population originating in the quota countries. This provision was conceived apparently simultaneously by Captain John B. Trevor and Senator David A. Reed in 1924. It is, I believe, an outstanding piece of statesmanship. The Act of 1924 provided that the Secretaries of State, Commerce

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

and Labor should ascertain what proportion of our entire population in 1920 originating in the quota countries, that is originating outside of North and South America, came from each country or was descended from those who came from that country and then that country's quota should be such proportion of 150,000, the number to be admissible in any year beginning in 1927. The method of computation of national origins and the attacks on it will be considered in Chapter XII. It was designed to base immigration on the entire population and not the foreign-born only. If the commission found, as is the case, that of our white population originating outside of this continent, 90,880,000 in all, 48% originated in Great Britain and North Ireland, then Great Britain and North Ireland were entitled to 48% of 150,000 yearly immigrants; if Germany had contributed 15%, her quota should be 15%. The result of the national origins basis is to give northwest Europe about the same proportion of our quota immigration as the 1890 basis gives, but there is a considerable shift between the various nations of northwest Europe. This shift is the cause of the controversy last winter when the alien blocs endeavored to repeal the origins provision, and which resulted in postponing its effective date until 1928.

To observe the full effects of the Acts of 1921 and 1924 I give below the actual numbers of immigrants from the quota countries in the year ending June 30, 1914 (the last full year before the war), in 1921 (all but the last month of which was free from the opera-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

	1914	1921	1921 Act Quotas	1924 Act Quotas 1890 Basis	Origins Basis
Northwest Europe					
Great Britain...	48,729	51,142	} 77,342	34,007	73,039
Ireland.....	24,688	28,435			
Irish Free State.					
Germany.....	35,734	6,803	67,607	51,227	23,428
Netherlands....	6,321	6,493	3,607	1,648	2,421
Norway.....	8,329	7,423	12,202	6,453	2,267
Sweden.....	14,800	9,171	20,042	9,561	3,259
Other Northwest Europe.....	25,532	29,084	16,830	9,536	6,689
Total Northwest					
Europe.....	164,133	138,551	197,630	140,999	124,965
Southeast Europe					
Austria.....	134,831	4,947	7,451	785	1,486
Hungary.....	143,321	7,702	5,638	473	967
Greece.....	35,832	28,502	3,294	100	367
Italy.....	283,738	272,260	42,057	3,845	6,091
Poland.....		95,089	31,146	5,982	4,978
Russia.....	255,660	6,398	24,405	2,248	4,781
Czecho-Slovakia		40,884	14,357	3,073	2,248
Jugo-Slavia....		23,536	6,426	671	777
Other Southeast- ern Europe...	40,876	34,495	21,234	3,146	3,548
Total Southeast- ern Europe...	894,258	513,813	156,008	20,323	25,234
Total Asia.....	34,273	25,034	3,684	1,624	1,633
Total Africa.....	1,539	1,301	122	1,200	1,200
Total Australasia..	1,446	2,281	359	521	500
Not specified.....	136	130			
Grand Totals...	1,095,785	681,110	357,803	164,667	153,541

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

tion of the quota act of 1921), the quotas under the 1921 Act, and under the 1890 basis and the origins basis of the 1924 Act.

Since the total number of immigrants has been steadily diminished, it is more pertinent to compare the percentages from each section of the globe. They are given below:

	1914	1921	1921	1924 Quotas	
	Per-	Per-	Quotas	1890	Ori-
	cent-	cent-	Per-	Basis	gins
	ages	ages	cent-	Per-	Per-
			ages	cent-	cent-
				ages	ages
Northwest Europe.....	14.9	20.30	55.2	85.6	81.38
Southeast Europe.....	86.1	75.40	43.6	12.3	16.44
Asia.....	3.1	3.60	1.	.99	1.06
Africa.....	.14	.19	.034	.72	.78
Australasia.....	.14	.33	.10	.31	.32
Not specified.....	.01	.019			

Thus we find that while of the unrestricted immigration of 1914 Italy sent 283,738, she can send only 3,845 under the 1890 foreign born basis and 6,091 on the origins basis. Russia sent 255,660 and under the 1890 basis Soviet Russia can send 2,248, Esthonia 124, Latvia 142, Lithuania 344, Finland 471, or 3,329 in all. Under the origins system Soviet Russia can send 4,781, Esthonia 109, Latvia 184, Lithuania 494, Finland 559 or 6,127 in all. Poland, of course, has no figures for 1914. In 1921 she sent 95,089. Under the 1890 basis she can send 5,982 and under the origins 4,978. Czecho-Slovakia sent 40,884 in

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

1921 and under the 1890 basis can send 3,073 and under the origins 2,248. Jugo-Slavia goes down from 23,536 in 1920 to 671 under the 1890 and 777 under the origins. Great Britain sent 48,729 in 1914 and Ireland 24,688. Under the 1890 system Great Britain and North Ireland can send 34,007 and the Irish Free State 28,567. Under the origins system Great Britain and North Ireland can send 73,039 and the Irish Free State 13,862. In 1914 Germany sent 35,734; under the 1890 basis she can send 51,227, and under the origins 23,428.

In 1921, therefore, 75.4% of our immigration from quota countries was from eastern and southern Europe. Under the Quota Act based on the 1919 census 55.2% was from northern and western Europe; under the Act of 1924, based on the 1890 census, it is 85.6%; and after 1927, based on national origins, 81.4% will be from northern and western Europe.

The series of immigration acts beginning in 1917 and ending in 1924 has, therefore, completely changed the source of our immigration. If the flow of immigration be considered a natural flow, then by legislation we have completely changed the natural flow of peoples to America.

2. MOTIVE OF THE QUOTA LEGISLATION

Moreover, the motive of this legislation has been, more or less avowedly, to do just what has been done—namely, change the source of our immigration. A *Brief in Favor of the Literacy Test* prepared by the

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

Immigration Restriction League in 1914, pointed out that in 1909 the illiteracy of the English was .7%, the Scotch .5%, the Scandinavians .2%, the Irish 1.5%, the Germans 6.3%, while that of the South Italians was 56.9%, the Russians 42.7%, the Poles 39.9%, the Greeks 26.1% and that of the Bulgarians, Serbs and Montenegrins 46.5%.

The brief stated, "From this it appears that the illiteracy of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe is over twelve times as great as that of aliens from northwestern Europe, and that the illiteracy of Armenians, Japanese and Syrians is also high."

Mr. John L. Burnett, Chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, was even more explicit. In a speech in the House on April 29, 1908, he declared:

It is against those of a different race from us that my principal objection is aimed. I do not contend that because a man is illiterate, he is necessarily vicious; nor would I debar him merely because of the fact that he can not read, if he is of the Caucasian race and otherwise a desirable person. I favor this restriction because it appears to me to be the only practicable way in which any people of an undesirable race can be excluded. We could not without perhaps becoming involved in serious international complications, enact a law which would say that no Italian or Syrian, Russian or Greek shall be admitted. We have done this with the Chinese, but I doubt if European nations would stand for such legislation. Hence if the end desired can be reached by the educational test, would it not be better to bring it about in that way?

The Report of the Immigration Commission in

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

1911 was distinctly based on the feeling that the immigration from southern and eastern Europe must be reduced. Its *Brief Statement of Conclusions and Recommendations* pointed out that whereas, "From 1819 to 1883 more than 95% of the total immigration from Europe originated in the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, France and Switzerland," that, "Following 1883, there was a rapid change in the ethnical character of European immigration and in recent years more than 70% of the movement has originated in Southern and Eastern Europe." The statement proceeded to dwell on the undue percentage of diseased, criminal, mentally defective and dependent immigrants in this "new immigration" but it is clear that, like Mr. Burnett, the Commission was vaguely conscious of the fact that this new immigration was strangely different from the old immigration, and from our old dominant stock—a sense of difference which is the root of the whole later immigration legislation but which its opponents, the advocates of individual selection, never seem to sense or to appreciate.¹

The Commission declared:

The new immigration as a class is far less intelligent than the old; more than one-third of all those over 14 years of age being illiterate when admitted. Racially, they are for the most part essentially unlike the British, German and other peoples who came during the period prior to 1880 and generally speaking they are actuated in coming by different ideals, for the old immigration came to be a part of the country, while the new,

¹ *Brief Statement of Conclusions and Recommendations*, p. 15.

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

in a large measure, comes with the intention of profiting in a pecuniary way, by the superior advantages of the new world, and then returning to the old country.²

The Commission proceeded to recommend the reading and writing test as the most feasible method of "restricting undesirable immigration."

It did not argue specifically, as did Mr. Burnett, that the reading and writing test would restrict what it called undesirable immigration, and in fact the minority report by Mr. William S. Bennett objected to the report on the ground that "The educational test proposed is a selective test for which no logical argument can be based on the report." But the whole report was implicit with the remedy. Immigration from southern and eastern Europe must be reduced in numbers and the literacy test would do it.

The full effect of the literacy test can never be known. It was passed in 1917 just before we entered the war. In that year and in 1918 and 1919 very little immigration came to this country. But in 1920 our immigration from Europe was 246,295 and 64% of that came from southern and eastern Europe. The literacy test may have greatly reduced numbers of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, but it reduced them by preventing their coming and no one, of course, can check such figures. The fact remains that it did not change the proportions of those who actually did come. By 1920 the situation was just where it had started from. A great

² *Ibid.*, p. 9.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

flood of immigration, most of it from southern Europe, was feared for 1921. Serious dislocation of our labor and social conditions was apprehended. A Senatorial committee held hearings, and eventually the act of 1921, an avowedly emergency measure, was passed. Its supporters felt the need of a homogeneous nation and the danger of disproportionate immigration from Southeastern Europe, but the desire to regulate immigration in accordance with our national content was not yet explicit. The act limited the natural flow from Southeastern Europe, partly by the mere general reduction in numbers and partly by restricting it to 43.6% of the quota immigration whereas unregulated immigration would have been from 60% to 70% from Southeastern Europe. The theory of limitation became more definite in the next four years. In presenting the 1924 bill to the House, Representative Johnson of Washington gave voice to the new ideal of America, an ideal, after all, of the old America but almost extinguished in the long and almost fatal devotion to the doctrine of a free haven for the oppressed of all races, and to the doctrine of the melting-pot which has so long enamored Americans. It was the appeal for a unified and coherent America. He stated that 600,000 persons in Russia had applied for passports to come to the United States, that 70,000 were then assembled at Warsaw and that 300,000 Italians were seeking admission to this country.

"It has become necessary," he said, "that the United States cease to function as an asylum." Pre-

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

dictions are very dangerous, but I believe that these words mark the end of an epoch and begin a newer and truer one, an epoch dominated by an opinion that a nation cannot be formed of a melting-pot, that a nation is a product of a united racial stock, and that it is formed slowly and not by sympathetic magic.

"With this immigration act," Mr. Johnson said later, "the United States is undertaking to regulate and control the great problem of the commingling of races. Our hope is in a homogeneous nation. At one time we welcomed all and all helped to build the Nation. But now asylum ends. This nation must be as completely unified as any nation in Europe or Asia. Self-preservation demands it."^a Surely these are statesmanlike words.

Both the purpose and the effect of this legislation have been, therefore, to reduce numbers and particularly numbers from southeastern Europe.

Naturally, it has aroused bitter opposition and has caused grave heartburnings. Indeed, the opposing forces were so powerful and so entrenched that its accomplishment is really amazing. It opposed, first, the insistent demand for, one might almost say the ingrained habit of receiving cheap labor; second, the pressure of immigrants already here in behalf of their relatives remaining in Europe; third, the intense, and it must be admitted, the beautiful ideal of America as a free haven for the oppressed of Europe. All of these entrenched ideals received their philosophy and drew their strength from the belief in the

Congressional Record, June 4, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

melting-pot—not always the same melting-pot, for, as we shall see, the ideas of the melting-pot of the old stock and of the immigrant are very different, but still the belief in a great transforming caldron which will soon, by sympathetic magic, make the immigrants one with us. Our belief has generally, until very late years, been that the assimilation process is quick and facile, and most of us have had no terrors of the freest immigration.

3. PLAN OF THE BOOK

The plan of this book will be to attempt to analyze these objections. It will attempt to show that the cry for more labor is exaggerated, that it is based on a false and evil philosophy, and a disbelief in our native worth and ability. It will attempt to show that selective immigration is largely a seductive fallacy, and that after all selection can never touch our main problem, which is restriction.

The argument is frankly based on a belief in the nation as a unit, on the belief that the evils of nationality are not inherent in it; that the loyalty, the literature, the law, the institutions, developed by the compact nation can as yet in our world be produced through no other agency; that moreover the coherent nation must be the unit for all presently conceivable relations between the various peoples of the world.

On this basis it will be argued that restriction is our first imperative necessity if we are to keep a sufficient portion of our population homogeneous to maintain our nationality. The argument will en-

PURPOSES OF IMMIGRATION QUOTA LAWS

deavor to show that nations come of slow growth and long travail, that they depend on like-mindedness and that if the United States becomes a hodge-podge of a score of races, no one of which is dominant, it will lose its unity and become like Metternich's idea of Italy, a geographical expression. If we but reflect, we shall see an ominous host of witnesses to the present extent of our political disintegration. This shows itself in every question of foreign politics. Our social unity, the common opinion which makes for an ordered law, the like-mindedness which produces literature, all are threatened by our growing heterogeneity.

CHAPTER II

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

IT HAS long been the assumption of the American people that immigration was a necessity for our industries, that our country would have stifled and decayed if it had not received a steady stream of immigration, and that now we will destroy our prosperity if the flow is cut off.

I. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE DEMAND

No more striking proof of this statement could be presented than the testimony before the Senate Committee on Immigration in January, 1921. The secretary of the Rural Land Owners' Association in Texas stated:

This is all I desire to say, gentlemen, that the future welfare of that section of the state is absolutely dependent upon the use of Mexican labor. If our farmers are deprived of the privilege of bringing in this Mexican labor at times when they need it, the agricultural development of that section of the country will be absolutely done for.¹

A business man from Miami, Florida, pleaded for negroes from the Bahamas to harvest Florida's crops. He said that Florida would be helpless without them.

¹ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 123.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

"They are law-abiding people. They do not sympathize with the unions. There are no radicals among them." ²

The cigarmakers of Florida called for Cuban immigrants. Cuba, as is well known, is, like Mexico, a mixture of Spanish, negro and Indian. But we were told that the country could not get along without the Cuban. He is essential to the hand-made cigar industry of the United States. Americans won't do the work.

It is a very difficult, hard occupation,— it is a sedentary occupation—it is very difficult for an American to accustom himself to such labor. The Cubans are of small physique and they like that kind of work because it does not require much exertion.³

Congressman Hudspeth of Texas also asked that the literacy test and the proposed Johnson bill be suspended as to Mexicans. He declared that the Mexicans were needed for the beet-sugar and the cotton crops and as shepherds.⁴

A representative of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce asserted that the only supply of labor in the Southwest was the Mexican.

Mr. W. B. Mandeville representing the American Beet Sugar Company, added his voice to the demand for Mexican labor. He said that if "we can not have access to this surplus labor, that we need from the Mexican border to take care of our crops, I don't see how in the world it is going to be possible to take

² *Ibid.*, p. 41.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

care of the beet-sugar crops of the west. It is going to be practically an impossibility." ⁵

The same story went up from all over the country. The construction industry said that it could not go on without immigration to furnish its unskilled labor. Brigadier-General Marshall, general manager of the Associated General Contractors of America, declared:

And any action that would lead to the lessening of immigration of the unskilled class of labor would seem to be directly against the interests of the country, thinking of the question not alone from the point of view of construction, but also from the point of view of agriculture. ⁶

A representative of the wholesale sash and door association of Chicago testified that:

We are quite largely dependent upon common labor, and have been affected by the shortage of labor during the past few years. The people of our country do not want to see the natural flow interrupted. ⁷

The implications and the necessity of the demand I will consider in a moment. But such the demand was, widespread, emphatic, almost hysterical.

The committee partly heeded it. It refused to pass the Johnson bill which would have interdicted all immigration for one year. Instead, it passed the first quota law, the quota law of 1921, limiting the immigration in any one year to 3% of the foreign-born population here in 1910, and that from any

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

one country to 3% of the persons here in 1910 born in that country.

Yet within six months after the employers had warned the committee of a shortage of labor in this country, there was hardly a section of the land where not only skilled but common labor was not a drug on the market. As soon, however, as conditions began to improve, the demand for freer immigration returned to the charge. In February, 1922, the National Association of Manufacturers published in its magazine, *American Industries*, a symposium of replies from forty-six leading business men of the country. The overwhelming vote was opposed to the quota law.

In January, 1923, the National Cannery Association declared that "the shortage of adequate labor is a serious and growing problem in the production and conservation of perishable food products" and urged that the quota law be modified to admit "a larger number of intelligent and desirable residents of other countries who are skilled in agricultural pursuits."⁸

The President of the National Manufacturers' Association in presenting resolutions of the Association in favor of freer immigration declared:

Unless rough labor is to be had in the basic industries, many skilled workers cannot be utilized. Already many departments in typical industrial establishments are not operating because it is impossible to secure common labor to perform necessary preliminary operations. The present condition, if unrelieved, will prevent necessary railroad expansion, extension and repairs,

⁸ *New York Times*, January 26, 1923.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

and further threaten the efficiency of our already impaired transportation service.⁹

Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, in a speech at Chicago in 1923, declared "that the protection of labor by restrictive legislation has been overdone and has resulted in higher costs to the consumer by making labor scarce and wages higher."¹⁰

In 1923 the Illinois Manufacturers' Association passed the following resolution to be submitted to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States:

"Whereas the operation of the three percent limitation of the immigration law has demonstrated its ineffectiveness as a measure to improve the character of immigration, has prevented desirable aliens from entering the country, and its continuance will mean economic disaster to the United States, Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the United States advocates the immediate repeal of the three percent law and further recommends that immigration to this country be restricted only to consistent moral, physical, and financial qualifications, with provision of the determination of admissibility of aliens prior to their departure from their native land."¹¹

In 1922, also, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts called for a change in our immigration policy on the ground that "a growing shortage of labor was interfering with necessary production."¹²

⁹ Circular dated December 28, 1922.

¹⁰ *Chicago Tribune*, September 22, 1923.

¹¹ Questions for Consideration, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, New York City, May 8, 9, 10, 1923, p. 16.

¹² *New York Times*, October 19, 1922.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

Mr. Elbert H. Gary, Chairman of the Board of the United States Steel Corporation, declared to his stockholders at their annual meeting in 1923:

You are aware of the fact that in recent years, Congress has passed a law which restricts immigration. In my judgment the law as passed was one of the worst things this country has ever done for itself economically.¹³

The *New York Journal of Commerce* argued, "A certain class of worker is necessary to the progress of our industries and the present immigration law has practically eliminated this class."¹⁴ The *New York Herald* said, "If the number of manual workers allowed to come into the United States is not increased, the country cannot go on with the digging, the road-making, the railroad construction, the building, the farming, and all the other foundational work that must underlie the whole national structure of production and business."¹⁵ The *New York Times* of January 3, 1923, editorially quoted the New York Board of Trade as declaring for selective immigration without regard for quota. It said that the report "hits the nail on the head when it says that 'without unskilled labor the heart-beat of our country's activities will stop.'"

In its issue of May 17, 1924, the *Literary Digest* presented a symposium of views on the proposed Johnson Quota Act, since enacted, from the foreign language press. Let one quotation suffice. The

¹³ *New York Times*, April 24, 1923.

¹⁴ Quoted *Literary Digest*, November 18, 1922.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

others, a great number, were all similar in tone and content.

The *Daily Svornost*, a Chicago Bohemian journal, argued

Of what value it [the immigrant element] is to our country could best be visualized by picturing what disaster would befall all the metropolitan cities and all the large manufacturing establishments, the public utility and transportation companies, if the various national groups, including only the foreign born inhabitants and the first generation should leave this country. Practically all industry and commerce would stop and all the large cities would practically be wiped out, for there are very few Americans whose grandparents or remote ancestors came to this country, who are employed at manual labor.

Mr. William H. Barr, president of the Inter-Racial Council, said on March 22, 1923:

To what extent would this country have progressed, if during the last twenty years the admission of the foreign born had been prohibited? Who would man the mines, the iron and steel mills, and the foundries, the machine shops, the silk mills and knit good shops, the glass factories, lumber mills and other industries? Our native born workers are largely skilled workmen—as they should be—and we cannot look to them to provide the industries with the primary grades of work. We must look to the foreign born to provide the unskilled labor. If this class of labor is not forthcoming, how can the wheels of industry turn around?¹⁶

The above quotations give a fair and a rather complete exposition of the opposition to the quota law which is based on the need for labor. This demand

¹⁶ *New York Times*, March 23, 1922.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR for cheap labor has been in the past all-conclusive. No matter what fears we might have from our pouring immigration, we quieted them when we were told that the country would go to ruin without ever new levies of raw labor. At last we began to question this scare cry. Indeed, it was time that it was subjected to severe scrutiny.

2. MUCH SHORTAGE IS SECTIONAL AND SEASONAL

In the first place, we shall find that much of our shortage is regional and not national. It is caused to some extent by a poor distribution of labor. A careful survey of labor conditions in New England was made in the summer of 1925 by the Boston Chamber of Commerce. The report noted:

It is to be remembered, however, that under present circumstances we have certain sources of native unskilled labor available that is being sought out by other sections of the country. As an instance, the coal mining population is greater than the country needs for the purpose. Our agricultural population has the largest natural increase, and its production under improved methods has been so large as to produce too low prices for the farmer, and to upset the balance of business by the inability of the farmer to purchase. The question arises whether we cannot recruit profitably from this source if a proper level of agricultural prices is to be maintained. This with the increased use of labor-saving devices and decreases of seasonal factory work may be the best available means of compensating for the lack of imported unskilled labor.¹⁷

¹⁷ Report Committee on Immigration and Amalgamation, Boston Chamber of Commerce, September 10, 1925, p. 8.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The report also suggests that if a scarcity of labor in any branch develops, that there is no reason why selection, within the quota, designed to favor that demand of labor at the expense of others cannot be resorted to.

Much shortage, moreover, is merely seasonal. In the harvesting season extra labor is needed and a shortage will naturally exist unless there is actual oversupply at other times and in other places. Mr. Alexander Jackson, Agricultural Agent of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, answered when asked at the Senate hearings in January, 1921, if there was a labor shortage:

Not at the present time, I think. I was out in Colorado two weeks ago, and there was no scarcity then. There is a scarcity at certain times of the year. Colorado would have a scarcity during the beet harvesting season.

The Chairman commented:

Well, it is necessary to have labor if you are going to have a beet crop, isn't it?

He answered:

But, Mr. Chairman, that is just for two or three months' time. What are we going to do with these people after the beet crop and the Kansas wheat crops are harvested?¹⁸

In short, if you insist on never having a seasonal shortage, you create a surplus for the other seasons of the year.

¹⁸ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 333.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

3. ALWAYS A SHORTAGE

The outstanding fact, however, is that it seems that there is always a shortage. No matter when restriction of immigration is proposed—in 1907, in 1913 when the literacy test was being pressed, in 1920 just before the great depression, in 1921 when the great depression had already started—always there is a dearth of labor.

On December 7, 1920, William H. Barr, President of the Inter-Racial Council, issued a statement "in which he argued against restriction of immigration, maintaining that there was no surplus of unskilled laborers in industry generally" and "that such unskilled workers as did arrive were not in competition with the more skilled American worker. . . ."¹⁹ This would seem to indicate that no Americans were unskilled workers and that competition of immigration in the field of unskilled labor was of no moment.

P. A. S. Franklin of the International Mercantile Marine Corporation declared on December 11, 1920 on returning from Europe, that any drastic restriction of immigration would be folly. "There is a shortage of labor in this country and we need every hand we can get," he said.

Yet the terrible depression of 1920-1921 was already on the country. Its first effects had been realized by December, 1920. By January, 1921, when the hearings began before the Senate Committee, the force of the blow was widely and keenly felt.

¹⁹ *New York Times*, December 8, 1920.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The witnesses then admitted that many men were out of work, but they said, like Mr. Barr, that it was skilled labor that was idle. They asserted that there was still a shortage of unskilled labor and of course it was unskilled labor that they wanted.

At the very time these witnesses were declaring that there was a shortage of unskilled labor, there were 2,500,000 men and women out of work. Mr. W. I. King in his book *Business Cycles* published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, estimates that in the first three months of 1921 there were 2,404,000 fewer persons employed than in the first three months of 1920. The number employed in factories was almost two millions less in the first quarter of 1921 than it had been in the first quarter of 1920.²⁰ "In Jan., 1921," says the Encyclopaedia Britannica, "an unemployment survey made by the U. S. Employment Service for 35 states and the District of Columbia showed 9,402,000 employed in Jan. 1920 and 6,070,648 employed Jan. 1921, and estimated 3,473,446 as unemployed in the country as a whole. The greatest reduction in employment during this period was that of 82% in Michigan, 50% in Ohio and Indiana, 44% in Illinois, 43% in Connecticut, 38% in Massachusetts, 28% in New York, 32% in Wisconsin, 22% in New Jersey. In establishments studied by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the greatest decreases between Feb., 1920, and Feb., 1921 were 44.2% in hosiery and underwear, and 41% in automobile manufactures; the smallest

²⁰ W. I. King, *Business Cycles*, p. 30.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR
decreases were 2% in bituminous coal mining and
.1% in cotton manufacturing.”²¹

The statistics do not show what portion of those unemployed was skilled and what portion was unskilled labor, but it is manifest that such enormous numbers of unemployment were cross-sections of society, and not from any one group. Factory labor was probably the worst hit of all, and when factories close the skilled are certainly not the only ones to suffer.

The total inaccuracy of these claims of a labor shortage made in December, 1920, and January, 1921, throws a flood of light on the whole demands for labor on the part of industry. They were crying out that there was a shortage of labor when the depression was actually on us. So insensitive were they to actual conditions that one wonders if their belief in a labor shortage is not to a great extent a complex. I believe that it is largely a complex. I believe, in short, that many of them would never agree, short of the actual overcrowding of this country, that there could be too many immigrants.

For, what these men mean is that there should never be a labor shortage. The flow must never be checked in prosperous times. Mr. James A. Emery, counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, stated this definitely before the National Republican Club on January 27, 1922. The newspaper dispatch states that he urged “legislation to permit American industry to seek the kind of labor it needed

²¹ Encyclopaedia Britannica, 12th Ed., Vol. 32, p. 839.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

in foreign countries, and to make contracts with the laborers, something now prevented by the law prohibiting the importation of foreign labor under contract. He also advocated placing in the Commissioner of Labor power to set aside the provisions of the three percent law when it could be demonstrated that there was an actual shortage of labor in this country."²² The Committee of the Association phrased this policy as follows:

The Secretary of Labor ought to be authorized, upon the presentation to him of satisfactory evidence of a continuing shortage of labor of a particular class or type, to admit otherwise admissible aliens in excess of the quota until in his judgment such a condition is improved.

This provision would permit no change in the standards of admission, would leave the key of the immigrant gate in the hands of the Secretary of Labor. The proposal completely answers those who say there is no labor shortage by requiring those who assert it to demonstrate the fact in concrete terms to the Secretary of Labor. If such is not the fact, the amendment can do no harm. If such is the fact, what excuse can be given for refusing to remedy a condition which imperils American economic life?²³

It is true that under the proposed amendment the Secretary must find that the shortage is "continuing." But the decision of what is "continuing" would be left to the Secretary of Labor and there is no doubt, from the testimony we have quoted, that employers would call any shortage continuing which affected

²² *New York Times*, January 28, 1922.

²³ Letter dated December 22, 1922.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

their industries unfavorably in expanding times. They would call on the Secretary of Labor for more labor, and if they got it they would merely increase the amount of labor to be thrown on the public when times slackened.

The demand then is based on a false, even vicious, theory of labor. It is based on the theory that the employer must not have to bid for his labor but that labor must always bid for its employer. In times of industrial depression, so far as we have now progressed, there seems to be no escape from the fact that labor must bid for work. But it is not necessary in times of expansion. It is wicked to provide that there must be a supply on hand at all times. It implies, necessarily, that there must always be a large number of unemployed, or at least an excess of demand over supply, while in times of depression there will be an unemployed class made larger by the fact that there was more than enough labor in times of expansion. Thus, if the labor demand in good times would take care of 22,000,000 persons, and there is supplied 24,000,000 persons so there may not be a shortage, there will be a surplus of 4,000,000 persons in times of depression, if work can only be supplied for 20,000,000, whereas, if there were no oversupply for times of expansion, the surplus in times of depression would only be 2,000,000.

It is no wonder that Mr. Jackson of the Rock Island asked: "What are we going to do with these people after the beet crop and the Kansas wheat crops are harvested?" And we must also ask generally:

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

What is going to become of the immigrant who floods the market in time of expansion, when the lean years come?

4. AN ENDLESS DEMAND FOR CHEAP LABOR

The policy is vicious, secondly, because, after all, it is a policy based on a demand for cheap labor. The employers who speak of the necessity of meeting a shortage of labor, mean too often the necessity of supplying a labor demand at their own price. It is easy to impugn motives and to fall into the facile denunciations of radicals. But after reading page after page of testimony and appeals by employers, one is forced to conclude that the first concern of many seems to be the satisfaction of the present want for labor, and cheap labor, with little regard for the morrow.

The Southwest wants the Mexican, the Southeast the Cuban and the Bahaman negro, and there are still those who want the Japanese. A vice-president of a large manufacturing company inveighed passionately against the shortage of labor and the resultant high wages, and declared that we should let down the bars both for the Chinese and for the Japanese. Mr. Francis C. Harley, Secretary of the National Immigration Council, testified before the Senate Committee in 1921:

Because of the conditions that existed in the West, the big undertakings that were going on, for example, the development of our water power, the reclaiming of hundreds of millions of

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

acres of land, in the West, we needed a great many laborers. . . . Our committee planned to bring in Chinese labor, for our work and our plans were going along well when the Armistice came along.²⁴

Then it was thought that the returned soldier would fill the gap and the plan was abandoned.

The sober fact remains that the Japanese, the Chinese, the Hindoo, the Mexican and the Cuban, and the Bahaman negro, to say nothing of the "Hunkie," have all a lower wage scale than our native common labor. In short, it is not so much that labor cannot be found as that it cannot be found at the wage scale which it was willing to accept when it entered the country. The immigrant is the lowest in the scale, but soon demands the native rate, and when he does the employer calls for new immigrants at the low rate.

Indeed, many of the employers appearing before the Committee who called for alien labor admitted that they had had a labor supply but had lost it, and accordingly promptly demanded that the loss be made up from alien sources. The suspicion is strong that they were outbid by other markets, and consequently, bred in the old false philosophy, turned naturally to Europe for a new, cheap supply.

Mr. Walter Peteet, manager of the Agricultural Department of the Texas Chamber of Commerce, testified before the Committee:

I call the Committee's attention further to the fact of the estimate that was made by the State Commission of Labor

²⁴ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 382.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that the state lost during 1917-1918 150,000 negro laborers, who came to work on railroads and the factories in the North and that supply of labor has gone from us. A few of these negroes have returned, but nothing like the total number that left.²⁵

Another witness, representing a cotton growers' association, declared:

There was a time when we could get cotton pickers from the large cities—Houston, Dallas, Waco and other places—but that condition no longer exists. The laborers in those communities have drifted North. So then it is up to us to use what labor we have and what we can get and that is Mexican labor. We know nothing else. They are satisfactory to us as citizens; they are satisfactory to us as work hands; they work when we want them to; they give us value received, we pay them for it, and when we are through with them, they go back.²⁶

Mr. W. B. Mandeville, of the American Beet Sugar Company, urging Mexican labor for his industry, stated:

In the Northern parts of Colorado, and through Wyoming and Montana, up to the time of the war, there was practically no Mexican labor used. It was mostly composed of Bohemians, Russians and Belgians that they brought in from Nebraska, and Iowa, and out of those centers and these people have practically all vanished during the war and are still going.²⁷

Again he admitted:

There was a time a few years ago, when north and central Texas, which is more generally developed than our section, was able to obtain Negro labor, for the most part, to pick the

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 125.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 119.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

cotton crop, but for some reason or other, whether it is the short hours and the high wages and the bright lights of the city, I don't know but the Negro labor in Texas left the rural districts, and has gone to the cities, to a very large extent, so that each year there is a constantly increasing demand for Mexican labor.²⁸

A successful employer of negro labor in the lumber mills of the South was more sympathetic with the negro laborer. He flatly told me that the southern plantations had lost their labor supply because they did not treat it well enough or pay it well enough and that the plantations would never get the supply back. These employers become then the first to demand that a new supply of foreign labor be brought in to replace the labor they let drift away from them.

Here, then, is the first indication that the cry for immigrant labor is endless. As long as a supply is available to take the place of native labor that demands more pay, so long will there be a cry for more immigrant labor. If the only test is whether employers are asking for more labor, the test will never fail. Save in times of great depression, they will always want more labor below the native scale.

But the nature of the demands indicates more than that. It indicates that the demand will continue so long as the country is not filled up with settlers. Only when the saturation point is reached will the cry for more immigration cease. Mr. Millholland, a former inspector of immigration at New York,

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

declared in an article in the *Forum*, printed in the proceedings of the Committee:

From East to West, the cry of every farmer, every contractor, and employer is for labor,—labor to sow and to reap and to gather into barns; labor for the public works, the shops and for a thousand other forms of our activity. This labor must be found somewhere.

And he added that there was no limit now discernible to the population we could absorb. Two hundred and fifty million immigrants could settle in the South without the South "feeling the strain of excessive population. Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and Wyoming could accommodate them all [all of India's entire 300,000,000 people] with as much land as they had at home and each state still be in a position to yell, 'Come West, young man, come West.'" ²⁹ He said that there would be no end to the process until the country was filled up, and that we would "enter the danger zone according to Macauley's famous prediction, only when we have a population of 20,000 to the square mile"—that is 160,000,000 people. A billion people is the lowest limit most friends of free immigration will admit.

Mr. Louis Marshall likewise said that the only limit was the number that could find employment. "It all depends after all," he said, "upon the question of whether or not there is a need for the men." ³⁰ This was in January, 1921. He opposed the literacy

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 673.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR test, but aside from that he would let anyone in who wanted to come who was not forbidden by the personal tests effective at that time.

5. HANDS AND NOT CITIZENS

But the proof that what is wanted is cheap labor is even clearer. Employer after employer made it clear that he wanted hands and not citizens. The less intelligent, the less troublesome the labor was, the more he wanted it. One witness, speaking of the Bahaman negroes, said that he had never heard of them causing labor trouble. "They do not sympathize with the unions," he said. "There are no radicals among them."³¹ The Cuban, we are told, "is not a violator of laws and while many of them remain here for years and do not become naturalized, that is because of the fact that they do not take a great deal of interest in politics. They would just as soon not vote as vote."³² Apparently that is in their favor. The Mexicans, we are told, "have not brought into this country preconceived notions of erratic governmental policies or attempted in any way to impede the progress of orderly representative government."³³

One wonders if they brought into this country any ideas of government at all, and whether this is the same country to which came the sober signers of the *Mayflower* covenant.

Mr. Harley flatly declared that "if there is any necessity for restriction, it would be better to restrict

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 58.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 73.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the intellectual from coming into this country." He asked that we allow "the illiterate to come in, to allow the pick and shovel men and the farm laborers, and the house servants to come in, and bar the others, the educated ones, because we find that the educated fellow is the agitator." "We have, Senator," he continued, "a hundred million Americans, every one of them claiming to be of the intellectual class to-day. No one of them is willing to do the common labor."³⁴

Mr. R. G. Kirk, in an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* of February 17, 1923, flatly expressed the contractor's wish for the man who could wield a pick and shovel, whether he gave any promise of becoming an American citizen or not. "Right off the bat," he said, "we're going to lay ourselves open to a sweet beating by saying that it is not citizens we're after. There are enough Americans in America right now to replenish and subdue this country by the mere mathematics of the birth rate, provided that the present and coming generations would do the pick and shovel work. But we won't; therefore what we want, primarily, is not future citizens. We can produce all the American citizens we need ourselves—100% stuff, at that. What we need is pick and shovel men. Hewers of wood and drawers of water, I think is the classical stuff; muckers, in practical words, diggers, shovelers, lifters, luggers, pushers, grunters. What we want foreigners over here for is to do the dirty, back-breaking work. Why not

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

talk plain English? We won't do this work ourselves. . . . There was a time when this country needed citizens as much as it needed pick and shovel men; a time when its citizens were largely pick and shovel men. But the day for the need of importing citizens is past. . . . Little doubt in our American minds, which are Nordic minds, that the Nordic peoples are the steady, decent, strong folk of the earth, or that they are the finest raw material for American citizenship. But are they the best people for our pick-and-shovel work and which do we need, citizens or laborers?"

The demand is, then, for laborers rather than citizens. That means that the less intelligent a man is, the less educated, the less likely he is to become an American, the better workman he is. I need not argue with men so dense to all the lessons of our past that they would satisfy a demand for labor by stirring up generations of racial trouble among us, and creating in our midst mutually impenetrable racial groups absolutely incompatible with a harmonious democracy. Surely, as Woodrow Wilson said, we should have learned our lesson from the negro problem without introducing a Hindoo problem, a Jap problem or a Chinese problem. Nor need we argue long with men who declare that the more ignorant of government our immigrants are, the more like hands they are, the better immigrants they are. In a sentence, we are told that we want workers and not citizens. But what are we going to do with these

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

human machines, for that is all they are in the minds of these employers, when their work is done? Are we to send them back, deport them because they cannot become citizens? No, because we shall still need hands.

No more terrible proof could be wanted that what is demanded after all is cheap labor, for ignorant labor (whether the ignorance be absolute or relative in respect to our language and customs) is always the cheapest labor.

6. WILL AMERICANS DO COMMON LABOR?

But the clearest proof that there is no end to this demand short of the complete filling up of the country is the constant cry that the American-born will not do common labor, and therefore a constant new supply must be added. Apparently this spirit pervades the new arrival as well as the much condemned native stock. Mr. Harley, as we have seen, asserted that we have "a hundred million Americans every one of them claiming to be of the intellectual class to-day, no one of them willing to do the common work."

On January 3, 1923, Mr. James A. Emery, General Counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, presented the objections to the quota law of the national association and nine state associations, represented in its national council. He was quoted in the newspapers as declaring that "for a hundred years or more this country had been drawing on the other nations of the world to do its rough labor; that

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

native born American labor is growing more loath each generation to do the pick and shovel or other hard work their immigrant ancestors did."³⁵

The *Westliche Herald* of Winona, Wisconsin, actually declared that the native American stock lacks the pioneer spirit.

The American born [it said] are not very anxious to cut-over a piece of land, grub out the stumps and make the land productive, or in fact develop anything else in the wilderness that takes any great amount of effort, hardship and privation because the American wants to make his money in an easier way and generally finds a way to do it. . . . We can not get any too much immigration, otherwise it will take another two or three hundred years to develop the great west. Why do something in two or three hundred years' time that might be done in from fifteen to twenty-five years?³⁶

A spokesman before the Senate Committee expressed the same belief of the softness of the American. He was the Immigration Commissioner of South Dakota. He declared that his state was "flat and there are but few trees and the country presents a rather desolate appearance. But those men of foreign birth are content with their lot out there; they will stay out there and they make good farmers, persevere year after year in the face of discouragements that would daunt the average American."³⁷ Again the slur against the native American, a slur which one finds at every hand in immigration arguments, and one that comes a little inopportunately so soon

³⁵ *New York Times*, January 4, 1923.

³⁶ *Literary Digest*, May 17, 1924.

³⁷ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 235.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

after the war in which native sons bore hardships with as great fortitude as their fathers or their immigrant brothers.

Mr. Herman L. Flam of the Associated Dress Manufacturers stated, "Now the life of the workers in our shops is about three years, for in that time we lose them by marriage. Unless we can replenish them by labor coming over from Europe, how are we going to supply the demands of the people of the country and try to reduce the cost of the merchandise that we supply and increase the output?"³⁸ So we must import new labor, unspoiled by our American aversion to dirty work, which in a few years' time becomes contaminated by the American virus and then we must import new labor.

Could there be a more vicious circle? There is no end to it until the limit of population is reached. And that end is not so far off. The best authorities do not agree with bold guesses that the limit is a billion people. Professor East's book, *Mankind at the Crossroads*, shows by an argument, which I shall outline later, that the crude assumptions of our limitless space for accommodating new peoples is not warranted by the facts. He sets the limit at about 200,000,000. Professor Raymond Pearl by an entirely different calculation arrives at about the same figure.³⁹ It is not the place here to consider all the implications of these estimates. If they are correct, and I believe they are far nearer the truth than the

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

³⁹ *The Biology of Population Growth*, Raymond Pearl, pp. 14, 24.

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

gay estimates of a billion or more, it simply means that in the near future, perhaps within one hundred years, we shall have to face the problem of providing our own rough labor. Even if they are not correct, the consequences of our importing cheap labor indefinitely will be really more disastrous than if the limit is near in sight. For if the limit is far distant, then we keep up our process until that limit is reached, getting ever rarer and more alien immigrants, until by the time the country is filled up even the population of European origin might be but a small minority of the whole. The necessity of facing the work of performing our own labor would be postponed but the consequences of refusing to do so would be merely increased. If, on the other hand, our population is to be stationary within one hundred years, we dilute and alter our stock for only one hundred years instead of an indefinite future. But, on the other hand, since the day when we must face the issue is not far distant, there is every reason why we should face it now.

We have begun to face it already. We are beginning to realize that not only the circle, but the philosophy, is vicious. It all comes down to the fact that common labor is not for us. Evidently if we could import slave labor we would do it. That being impossible, we import alien labor of a lower standard of living. But the difference between slave labor and alien labor is that alien labor soon becomes tainted with the American virus and refuses to do the dirty work.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Nothing about such a theory could be more damning than its truth. If this is true, it means that America is doomed, for no nation can endure which will not do its own work.

If true, moreover, it would mean that Americans are permeated by a false and snobbish philosophy of life, a contempt for common and humble toil. But, we are asked, do you want American boys to do the work the immigrants will do? Does not democracy mean that a man may rise to a better position than his father? A son of an immigrant said to me that he would consider himself a failure if he had been a mechanic as his father had been before him. There is endless testimony that the sons and daughters of immigrants look down on their humble parents who work with their hands, and the disdain is not all a product of the alien ways of the immigrants.

Well, our democracy certainly does mean that if a man's father was a farm laborer or a day-laborer, he need not be. Our ideal is certainly a career open to talents. But it surely does not mean that if a man follows in his father's footsteps he is to be pitied or scorned. It does not mean that common labor must be avoided in order to be happy. It does not mean that a young man, who is strong and able but not fitted for a skilled trade, a profession or a business and remains a farm-hand or a common workman, is not filling an honorable place in his community.

Yet the evil doctrine has actually obtained currency in our country that common labor is menial and unworthy. I think it can be traced to immigra-

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

tion. Each new race of immigrants, as it has come in, has turned to the work it could do, and as it was new and untrained, largely from rural surroundings and ignorant of our language, in all cases save the Jews, it has turned to manual labor for its start in this country. The American did common labor before the immigrant came. But when the latter came, he refused to work with the immigrant. He refused to be classed, in the old days, with the Irish and the German, and then the Irish and the German refused to be classed with the "dagos" and "wops" and "Hunkies," and if we go on the "dagos" and "wops" will refuse to be classed with the Japs, Chinese and Hindoos. The natural and understandable antipathy of races to each other has accordingly been interpreted as an antipathy to common labor. Because Americans will not work at manual labor alongside of foreigners, it is said that they will not work at manual labor at all.

If this is so, then we are the first nation in the history of the world that has not been able to produce its own labor. The French, the English, the Scotch the Germans, while they import some labor, supply basically all their common labor. The United States has been able to glut its labor market because of its immigration supply, but no other nation has been able to do so in any comparable degree. Our power to do so has been due to adventitious and artificial conditions, which is one proof that it is, if not an evil, certainly not a permanently possible policy. Moreover, until the last generation, Americans like-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

wise supplied their own labor. The great labor of clearing the land in the colonies, the great blazing of the trail into the Middle West, and more recently the making of the Far West, all were done largely by the hardy, sinewy native stock, restless, adventurous, asking no favors of man or nature in its willingness to undertake great adventures. If, then, Commissioner Liggett's statement quoted above, to the effect that Americans will not endure the loneliness and hardships of farming in the Northwest, is correct, the degeneracy has come with startling swiftness for it is but a generation since the great West was peopled by men and women of the old American stock. If immigration has killed the pioneering spirit, then indeed no better reason for reducing or cutting off immigration until we regain our self-reliance and endurance could be found.

Of course, as a friend to whom I quoted Commissioner Liggett's statement pointed out, the South Dakota land which he said the native American stock would not farm was poor land. Because they were dissatisfied with just such land as that of which Commissioner Liggett spoke, thousands of American farmers of the old stock in the past thirty years have left the Northwest for the richer lands of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The land they left or refused to take was poor land. With characteristic enterprise they sought the best land, as they have for the past hundred years. As well say they lost their pioneering spirit when they left New England for the Middle

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

West! The native American stock is still ever ready to pioneer.

Until the war, I lived all my life in Indiana, and have traveled much and lived to some extent in its rural districts. The farm and town boys and men of the native American stock regularly worked on the roads and as railroad section hands. They had no feeling that they were a disgrace to their ancestors who had done the same kind of work. There was no stigma attached to them. So far as I know, they still do this kind of work. But I do not believe that they would do it alongside of foreigners, and where the foreigners come in, they will turn to other work.

Representative Box of Texas said some very wholesome things to the Senate Committee on this depressing theory that Americans refuse to do common labor, that they are a patrician class who must have their common labor done for them. "I learned," he said, "as a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization studying the Japanese question in California last summer, that the college boys and girls used to go to the fields during vacation to gather berries and fruits. But they do not do it so much now. And we asked them, Why? 'Well,' a mother said, 'I cannot let my girl go out there to work among those Oriental coolies in the fields.' Some of the boys said, 'That is a Chink's or a Jap's job.'"⁴⁰

I trust that no one will upbraid these native boys

⁴⁰ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 230.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

for race intolerance. There are few of us who would not do the same. College boys will work in the harvest fields, but they will not do so alongside of Serbs or Roumanians. But it little matters whether we upbraid them or not. As a matter of fact, they will not do it. The condition exists, it is a deep-seated complex of our psychology, and it will not cease by railing against it. We are gradually learning that legislation must take account of human nature, and not insist that human nature should be as our fiat decrees.

The easiest answer to the catch-word that Americans won't do common labor is that it is not true. The census of 1920 showed that of the population over 10 years of age, 82,739,815 in all, the number employed for the native whites of native parentage, the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage, and the foreign-born whites, were as follows:

Native whites of native parentage		Native whites of mixed or foreign parentage		Foreign-born whites	
Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
16,788,668	3,733,329	6,237,012	2,110,454	6,627,797	1,118,463

Taking the males alone, the total of native parentage was 16,788,768 and the total for those of foreign or mixed parentage and foreign birth was 12,864,809. The native parentage group was 130% of the other two groups combined.

The census also shows the following numbers employed at common and skilled labor in some of the basic industries:

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

	Native parentage		Mixed or foreign parentage		Foreign born	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Coal mine operatives.....	296,671		102,271		278,001	
Iron mine operatives.....	4,458		4,812		24,017	
Copper mine operatives.....	6,821		6,245		22,539	
Gold and silver operatives.....	12,344		7,862		12,107	
Other mine operatives.....	25,167		4,146		7,673	
Farm laborers.....	1,939,948		413,477		203,902	
Farm laborers working out.....	1,060,096		230,195		163,475	
Gardeners.....	84,700		26,989		36,165	
Lumbermen.....	97,128		28,180		31,293	
Blacksmiths, forgers and hammermen.....	115,875		40,942		57,408	
Carpenters.....	473,369		153,693		221,276	
Laborers, building trade.....	246,583		80,390		140,209	
Laborers, chemical industry.....	18,820		7,918		26,876	
Laborers, clay, glass, stone industries.....	53,075		13,614		35,302	
Laborers, iron and steel industry.....	192,266		93,771		375,444	
Laborers, lumber and furniture industry.....	136,201		27,358		40,087	
Laborers, other industries.....	155,869		59,437		140,895	
Machinists, millwrights and tool makers.....	421,193		244,678		218,045	
Molders.....	41,231		25,424		50,339	
Semi-skilled:						
Clothing industry.....	20,177	38,751	22,282	87,606	94,824	81,585
Iron and steel.....	262,681		154,786		191,390	
Lumber.....	68,028		53,179		39,328	
Transportation:						
Laborers, garage, road and street.....	56,308		20,330		45,337	
Brakemen.....	78,845		24,111		6,490	
Railroad laborers.....	171,696		49,288		162,909	
Switchmen and yardmen.....	64,490		26,297		16,724	
Laborers:						
In stores.....	33,694		18,779		23,956	
In coal yards, warehouses, etc....	41,223		29,288		36,842	
In public service.....	29,310		14,989		31,130	
Domestic servants.....	61,469	240,199	26,747	149,203	76,241	209,393 ¹¹

I think these figures will be a little surprising to most of us and particularly to those who insist that the native-born Americans will not do common labor. We find that those of native parentage do far more than their share of the farm labor, of the gardening, of the labor in lumber and furniture mills;

¹¹ 1920 Census, Vol. IV, pp. 340 *et seq.*

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

they furnish more than their proportion of switchmen and yardmen. They are close to their proportion of lumbermen, of building laborers and of blacksmiths, forgemen and hammermen. They furnish more than half of the laborers in the clay, glass and stone industry, 43% of the coal miners and 31% of the laborers in the iron and steel industry. Native white girls of native parentage even supply 41% of our white domestic servants.

The American stock of native parentage, then, does more than half of our common labor. The simple explanation is that when foreign labor comes in, it does what it knows how to do and goes where it can easily find a place; it works for a lower wage and displaces that much native labor. If there were no foreign labor at all, there is no question but that native labor would still be doing all our work.

When we are told that the foreign-born have built our railroads and subways and bridges, we have a right to answer that the assertion appears to be of a piece with most of the arguments in defense of the immigrant, an exaltation of the immigrant at the expense of the native-born. It is time to say that the native-born did their share likewise—a greater share than that of the immigrant. It is time to ask where we would have been without the native-born. Likewise, to the frequent question of the free immigrationists to which they believe there is no answer, "Who would have done our common labor, who would have built our railroads, and operated our mines if it had not been for the immigrants?" the

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

answer is simply: The native-born would have done it as they did before the immigrant came and as they are doing now when not pushed aside by the immigrant.

7. IMMIGRATION DOES NOT INCREASE THE LABOR SUPPLY

It will do no harm to repeat here the famous argument of General Francis A. Walker made a generation ago, that without immigration the increase in population of the native stock would probably have been as great as it has been with immigration. Immigration, he proved, has not increased our labor supply. It has merely displaced native labor with foreign labor. He showed that from 1790 to 1800 when there was only 50,000 immigration, our population increased 35.1%; in the decade from 1800 to 1810, when immigration was only 70,000, our population increased 36.38%; between 1810 and 1820, when immigration amounted to 110,000, the increase was 33.07%; between 1820 and 1830, when immigration was 114,000, the increase was 33.15%. In the decade from 1830 to 1840 immigration was large, 599,000, and in the decade from 1840 to 1850 it was enormous, 1,713,000. Yet in these two decades the rate of increase of the population as a whole from natural increase and immigration both was practically the same as it had been when there was little immigration. In the decade from 1830 to 1840 it increased 32.6% and in the next decade 35.8%. Evidently the native increase fell off as soon as immigra-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

tion came in large quantities, and yet the total increase was practically steady. General Walker concluded that not only did the native decrease in rate come at the same time as the increase in immigration, but that the latter was the cause of the native decrease. He concluded that the native stock felt immediately the shock of the impress of the immigrant, felt his competition, felt the effect of his lower standards of living, and reduced his birth-rate almost automatically. "The American shrank from the competition thus thrust upon him." He was unwilling "to bring sons and daughters into the world to enter that competition." He ended his argument:

If the foregoing views are true, or contain any considerable degree of truth, foreign immigration into this country has from the time it first assumed large proportions, amounted, not to a re-enforcement of our population, but to a replacement of native by foreign stock. That if the foreigners had not come, the native element would long have filled the places the foreigners usurped, I entertain not a doubt. The competency of the American stock to do this it would be absurd to question, in the face of such a record as that from 1790 to 1830. During the period from 1830 to 1860 the material conditions of existence in this country were continually becoming more and more favorable to the increase of population from domestic sources. The old man-slaughtering medicine was being driven out of civilized communities; houses were becoming larger; the food and clothing of the people were becoming ampler and better. . . . No! Whatever were the causes which checked the growth of the native population, they were neither physiological nor climatic. They were mainly social and economic; and chief among them was the access of vast hordes of foreign immi-

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

grants, bringing with them a standard of living at which our own people revolted.⁴²

8. SUMMARY

It is true that we have developed a vicious circle now. By unhealthy and rapid increases of our population, we have created an unhealthy demand for and supply of labor. Our enterprises have been stimulated to use it. Demand has been stimulated for the labor necessary to supply the immigrant labor with its necessities. Much native labor has been pushed out of common labor and much has been permanently displaced and is unwilling to work alongside the foreign labor. But we can refuse and have refused to continue the process in all its madness. To continue it would mean to let immigration come in without quantity limit from now on as long as it cares to come, and we can be sure that there would never be a time when some employers would not say that our industry would be ruined if the supply were reduced.

The silly philosophy represented by the statement that without immigrant labor it may take one hundred years to develop the continent, whereas with it the job can be done in twenty-five years, should be directly challenged. It is not necessary to rely on General Walker's argument that our labor supply without immigration would have equaled our present supply with immigration, or to argue that in time our present population will supply all our labor

⁴² Walker, *Discussions in Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 2, pp. 424-6.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

needs. The real answer, the simple answer, is that it is not necessary to develop this continent in the next twenty-five years. What is the hurry? The continent is here and it will not run away. Are we, then, developing a continent here or men and women, a democracy or a mere industry? As we rush by on our concrete roads at fifty or sixty miles an hour and are at a loss to know what to do when we reach our destination, so one wonders if, when we finish developing the country, we may not be at a loss to know what to do next and ask why we were in such a hurry. We can also insist that we make the most of the labor supply already here, and if there is a shortage in one part of the country we must try to shift a surplus in one part to the section crying for labor instead of bringing in labor from abroad. We can refuse to adopt the policy of having a constant labor oversupply. We can make the utmost use of labor-saving devices. Gradually we shall get back to a healthy and decent opinion of labor and banish the present debilitating theory, caused, I am convinced, largely by the influx of immigration, that there is something degrading in common labor.

We cannot, therefore, subscribe to all the tenets of the faith of the free immigrationist. He sees a perpetual labor shortage. He would make a surplus in time of expansion, which would become a plague in time of depression. If he loses labor to another industry, or another section of the country, he does not bid for his old labor but seeks a new, cheap supply. There would be no limit to his demands until

THE QUOTA LAWS AND THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

the country was filled to overflowing as England and Belgium are filled now. He wants hands and not citizens. He would perpetuate the evil tradition that Americans will not work with their hands.

In fairness it should be said that an increasingly large number of able and far-sighted employers, not only refuse to take any part in the demand for immigrant labor but have a keen sense of the viciousness of the old philosophy. They realize that while we live by our industries we cannot consent that our industries expand to the detriment of our national spirit. Our need for labor must be guided and controlled by our insistence that the structure of our political and social life is our first consideration. If we cannot get labor which will make citizens, then we must sternly exclude it, even if by so doing we curtail our industry.

CHAPTER III

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

I. THE DEMAND FOR INDIVIDUAL SELECTION AND THE CLAIM OF DISCRIMINATION

The second main objection to the quota law is that it is based on a false principle. It selects by quantity and not by quality. It selects by races and not by individuals. It constitutes a gross discrimination against the races of southern and eastern Europe. The opponents of the quota law are loath to admit that any restriction is necessary, though they are much more apt to do so to-day than three years ago. But if there must be restriction, they declare it should be based on individual tests. A good Italian is as desirable as a good Englishman and a bad Englishman is as undesirable as a bad Italian. The quota law of 1924 is an insult to the southern and eastern European, it is founded on the divine right of Nordic superiority, and is a piece of arrogant know-nothingism.

The opponents of restriction have opposed all the immigration laws of the past ten years on the ground that restriction should be individual and not by classes. They bitterly opposed the literacy test on the ground that it was not a test of personal merit, and they still oppose it on that ground. In their opposition to the literacy test they had the support

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

of three Presidents of the United States, and a great body of very intelligent opinion. Many of our older stock, and probably most of the employing class, criticize it bitterly as based on a vicious and un-American theory. An excellent statement is contained in the two veto messages of President Wilson.

"In two particulars," he said in 1915, "of vital consequence, this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the people of the world outside of its borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men, and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education has been denied, without regard to their character, their purpose, or their natural capacity. . . . Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all save those who were not fitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support, or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

character or of personal fitness but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.”¹

He expressed the same opinion when he vetoed the literacy test bill of 1917, which became a law over his veto. He said that he could not rid himself “of the conviction that the literacy test constitutes a radical change in the policy of the Nation which is not justified in principle. It is not a test of character, of quality or of personal fitness, but would operate in most cases merely as a penalty for lack of opportunity in the country from which the alien seeking admission came. The opportunity to gain an education is in many cases one of the chief opportunities sought by the immigrant in coming to the United States, and our experience in the past has not been that the illiterate immigrant is as such an undesirable immigrant. Tests of quality and of purpose cannot be objected to on principle, but tests of opportunity surely may be.”²

The opponents of immigration restriction can hardly speak of the literacy test with patience. At the National Conference on Immigration in April, 1920, Mr. Louis Marshall declared, “The literacy test should be repealed at the earliest possible mo-

¹ *The Messages and Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Vol. I, p. 95, *Review of Reviews Corporation*, 1924.

² *Ibid.*, p. 357.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

ment.”³ Mr. Berg, speaking for the Jewish clothing employers in New York City, testified before the Senate Committee: “I have never been able to see the logic of the literacy test. I find that Bolshevism, if it exists, exists in those who can read and write and does not exist in those who cannot.”⁴

In December, 1922, the National Association of Manufacturers urged the repeal of the literacy test “which we believe experience has demonstrated to be an ineffective means of determining the quality of an alien and which neither measures the economic or moral value of the applicant for admission, but, on the contrary, may reject the possessor of those virtues while affording no obstacle to the literate revolutionary.”⁵ Mr. E. E. Loomis, president of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, objected that “the literacy test is keeping out thousands of steady men of the type who have entered this country in other years and become part of the bone and sinew of the nation.”⁶

There is no need to quote further. The opponents of the quota law are almost unanimous in opposing the literacy test. I have given these quotations of their opinions of the literacy test, although it is a dead issue, because they illustrate admirably the crux of the whole matter, the clash between selection and restriction.

³ *New York Times*, April 8, 1920.

⁴ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 78.

⁵ Circular letter, December 28, 1922.

⁶ *American Industries*, February, 1923.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Mr. Wilson said that the literacy test was restrictive. It has generally been condemned merely because it is restrictive, as if an immigration measure to be defensible, must be selective and not restrictive. The law, of course, is restrictive and it was intended to be restrictive. It will not suffice to call it restrictive and to imply that that condemns it of itself. The question is whether the restriction is necessary and desirable. That question has never been answered; indeed, it has hardly been considered by the opponents of the literacy test.

The same attack is made on the quota law. It is restrictive and not selective. At the meeting of the New York Chamber of Commerce in December, 1922, its President declared that his organization "believed in the principle of selective immigration."⁷ The Platform Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers declared by resolution in May, 1923, that, "It is to the interest of the Nation to replace our present unsystematic control of the alien with a constructive policy of selective immigration." It favored the entrance of every person who "really meant to incorporate himself into our society, but repel all who will not be a 'real addition to the wealth or strength of the United States. To this end we should effectively exclude the diseased, the criminal, the defective, those likely to become a public charge on the public, any who oppose our form of government or who would overthrow this republic or effect political change by force.'"

⁷ *New York Times*, December 4, 1922.¹

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

The American Bankers' Association on September 25, 1923, passed the following resolution:

The numerical restrictions upon immigration imposed by the present law do not, in our opinion, represent a satisfactory immigration policy. This law, limiting, with certain exceptions, the number of immigrants of each nationality admissible in any fiscal year to three percent of the number of the foreign born of the respective nationalities residing in this country in 1910—excluded many who are clearly fit socially and industrially for admission and who could make genuine additions to the national welfare. The law should be liberalized by providing for selection on the basis of quality, the selection to be made abroad as far as practicable.⁸

Early in 1923, the National Association of Manufacturers circularized its members on the quota law, and received replies from about fifty leading men. The general opinion was opposed to the law, and the almost unanimous conclusion was that legislation should be based on quality rather than on numbers. Mr. Gary declared that the "restrictions upon immigration should be directed to the question of quality rather than numbers."⁹ This in a sentence sums up the opinion of most of the opponents of the quota law.

They cannot see any rhyme or reason in it. In an editorial published July 2, 1921, soon after the 1921 law became effective, the *New York Times* said, "Of all the devices yet invented for keeping 'undesirables' out of the country, that of fixing a

⁸ *Ibid.*, September 26, 1923.

⁹ *American Industries*, February, 1923.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

'quota' of admissible aliens for each foreign country is probably the least intelligent, the most provocative of needless hardship and justified irritation. For the literacy test, some, though poor excuse can be given, but it is the wildest of absurdity that, because there have come over from a certain land, a certain number of persons, no more from that land shall be admitted, no matter what the individual qualifications of the applicant may be. . . . Quality, not quantity, should determine admissibility, and while quality is not easily ascertained, to do it should not be impossible in a country as well supplied with wise men as ours claims to be." Secretary of Labor Davis declared that for him "and for the bureau of immigration authorities, there are only two types of immigrants, the sound and the unsound."¹⁰

The delegation of New York Democratic Congressmen issued in 1924 a declaration attacking the Johnson bill as

particularly objectionable because it discriminates against certain nationalities already going to make up a great part of our population, and fans the flames of racial, religious and national hatreds and brands forever elements already here as an inferior stock. . . .

It discriminates [they declared] against Italy who gave us the great Columbus; it discriminates against Poland, who gave us our Revolutionary heroes, Kosciusko and Pulaski; it discriminates against Russia of the great Tolstoy, against Hungary who gave us the great Kossuth; against Greece, the land of Venizelos; against Czecho-Slovakia, from whence hails

¹⁰ *Chicago Daily News*, June 7, 1924.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

the distinguished Mazaryk; against Jugo-Slavia, who sent us the great inventor, Michael Pupin; and finally against France from whom came the immortal Lafayette and Rochambeau. . . .

This proposed law would adopt as a basis of entrance two percent of the foreign population of 1890. In its determined effort to be as unfair as possible, the Committee in addition to reducing the percentage from three percent, adopts as a basis, census figures thirty-four years old, instead of taking the census of 1920, now available, or even the census of 1910, the basis of the present law. This basis was deliberately selected to favor the so-called Nordic races and discriminate against races from southern and eastern Europe, which discrimination is indeed a new but perilous doctrine for democratic America founded on the declaration that 'all men are equal.'

Our great country is still big enough geographically, politically and socially to receive those persons knocking at our doors, whether of brain or brawn, who answer our mental, moral and physical requirements and can contribute to our science, our art, our literature, our commerce or our industry.¹¹

Congressman Dickstein declared that the Johnson bill "says to the Nordic races, 'You are desirable.' If our forefathers could see what their sons are doing now they would be ashamed of themselves." Congressman Livingston declared that the Johnson bill was discriminatory and unfair and "helps to undermine the fundamentals upon which our government is founded." Congressman La Guardia said, "The mathematics of the bill disclose the intentional discrimination against the Jews and Italians."¹²

¹¹ *New York Times*, February 25, 1924.

¹² *New York Times*, March 3, 1924.



AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Senator Walsh of Massachusetts asked :

What is the real driving force behind the movement basing the immigrant quota on the census of 1890? The peoples of the world will attribute it to our belief that 'the Nordic' is a superior race. The world will assume that the government considers the Italians, Greeks, Poles, Jews and the Slavs inferior to the Nordics, congenitally as well as culturally. This is a dangerous assumption.

Complaint is made that the recent aliens are not being assimilated. That they are not learning our language, are not improving their social conditions, is part of the indictment.

Who are responsible?

Is it not due largely to the fact that our immigrants have generally clustered about a limited number of industries in the industrial centers, forming themselves into colonies, not easily penetrated by American influences? This is not the immigrant's fault. . . .

Keep America American? Yes, but do not keep out of America through discriminatory immigration laws any lover of liberty, whatever his accident of birth may be, if he is willing to live in America, accept its ideals, and die if necessary for the preservation of American institutions.¹³

.

The Chairman of a woman's ward political club in Chicago said :

When what the world is striving for is peace and America is expected to lead the way, one cannot but question the expediency of this latest Congressional move. Our whole national emphasis now is being placed upon cementing friendships with the nations of the world rather than alienating what affection already exists. The Greeks, Italians, Poles, and Russian Jews, who seem to be the target of the framers of the bill, are too

¹³ Chicago *Herald-Examiner*, May 1, 1924.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

closely linked up with our governmental welfare to be slighted in any respect. While I believe that immigration should be placed upon a quota basis that is strictly enforced, any discrimination in the fixing of the quotas is not only contrary to our national ideals but dangerous to our welfare.¹⁴

An editorial in Hearst's *Chicago Examiner* said:

The percentage basis of limitation upon immigration never had justification in principle. At best it is a clumsy expedient. Entrance tests based on health, solvency and character are concededly necessary.

When we come to the immigrants already here, the attack becomes vehement. They denounce the quota law savagely, as an insult to their races. The Italians, the Greeks, the Slavs, and other South Europeans assert that the law is based on an assertion of inferiority in all South Europeans, founded on the Nordic myth, and their arguments are filled with scorn of Nordic delinquencies and peccadillos.

Representative Sabath of Illinois, representing a predominantly alien constituency and himself a native of Bohemia, of Hebrew blood, declared that the Johnson bill placed a "stamp of inferiority" upon 2,000,000 naturalized citizens in the United States, and that "it discriminated against the Latin races of Europe."¹⁵

The Reverend I. Mortimer Bloom, speaking at the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue in New York on April 19, 1924, declared:

The immigration bills are a denial and reversal of long-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, May 1, 1924.

¹⁵ *New York Times*, April 5, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

cherished American ideals and traditions, an affront to the memory of the founders of the Republic, a dagger thrust into the hearts of thousands of human beings who yearn for an opportunity to lead the normal, decent life, which their own lands deny them, and a staggering blow to humanitarians everywhere. Not as a Jew, not as one whose co-religionists happen to be seriously affected by this proposed legislation, but as an American steeped in the best traditions of the Land, an American who craves for his country to be true to the high and holy mission for which she was called into being, do I cry out against these discriminating, heartless, un-American bills.¹⁶

The attorney for the Polish Catholic Union of America said:

The bill discriminates against all but the Anglo-Saxon races in a way that I cannot believe is in accord with the spirit of Americanism. Reading between the lines one discovers that its authors seem to feel that the Jews, Bohemians, Italians, French, and others are mentally inferior to the more northern races.¹⁷

An Italian attorney said:

Such a bill tends fallaciously to establish inferiority between the so-called desirable Europeans and undesirable Mediterranean people. If a country such as Italy can produce immortals like Dante, Michael Angelo and Marconi, surely their descendants must of necessity inherit some of their virtues, their intelligence and respect for government.¹⁸

The President of the Jewish order of the B'nai B'rith said:

We have no quarrel with the idea that our government has the moral as well as the legal right to restrict its immigrants

¹⁶ *New York Times*, April 20, 1924.

¹⁷ *Chicago American*, May 1, 1924.

¹⁸ *Chicago American*, May 1, 1924.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

both as to numbers and as to character. Our sole objection to the present law rests on the fact that discrimination between races, instead of between individuals, forms the chief basis for selection. We believe we should pick our worthy American citizens from the most worthy individuals regardless of race. We reject the doctrine that a Nordic individual invariably makes a better American citizen than an Alpine or a Mediterranean.¹⁹

An Italian newspaper declared bitterly that "it is now settled that the Italians are an inferior race." Another Italian newspaper said that the Johnson bill was "offensive to the feelings of a large citizenry, to the dignity of friendly nations, to international comity and to historical truth."

A Chicago alderman declared that the Johnson bill

is the most vicious legislation ever directed at the great mass of American citizens who are of foreign birth or parentage. It is not disputed that there should be restrictions of immigration, but such restrictions should not be made prohibitive against the people of certain countries. The bill, by adopting the census of 1890, strikes a blow at national unity. This clause plainly states to the world that the people of northwestern Europe should be admitted in greater numbers than those of southeastern Europe.

This view, molded into law, will write racial prejudice and hate and will engender strife and ill-feeling among the great masses of the country.

That national unity of which we are so proud, that which has welded our citizens into a great nation, will undoubtedly

¹⁹ *New York Times*, April 21, 1925.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

suffer, and the great structure, the foundation of which is freedom of religious belief and action and equality of man, regardless of color, creed and place of birth, will be undermined.

Restriction of immigration should be based upon the personal qualifications of the immigrant, rather than his place of birth.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise attacked the Johnson bill as an "extemporized and unscientific bit of anthropology, evolved by a group of gentlemen connected with the Museum of Natural History, who know more about the Paleozoic and Mesozoic ages than they know of the present day." He said that he was asked at the Congressional hearing if he thought a foreigner had "a vested right in America," and said that he had replied in the negative but declared that "he did not believe that any man in Germany or England had a larger vested right in America than any man in southern or eastern Europe." He charged that the bill aimed to fix a status of "inferiority and degradation on the people" from southern and eastern Europe. "If Jesus and his twelve disciples were on earth to-day, they would have to cast lots as to which one of them would have the privilege of coming to the United States if the Johnson bill becomes a law, for under it the Palestine quota is reduced to one."²⁰

On the day that President Coolidge signed the 1924 law, Rabbi Wise expressed his sorrow in these moving words:

My heart is heavy to-night, for the President has given his

²⁰ *Ibid.*, January 6, 1924.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

approval to the Johnson immigration bill. When America, which is drunk with post-war hatreds and bitterness, returns to its sanity, it will surely repent of having sold its birth-right for a mess of immigrant stoppage.

The Chicago *Tribune* account of his talk continued:

Dr. Wise attacked bitterly the exclusion of the Mediterraneans, giving a roll-call of Michael Angelo, Dante, Savonarola and Verdi.

Suppose Johnson had been on the reception committee for Christopher Columbus. There would never have been an America for Mr. Johnson—and that might have been just as well.²¹

Pages of similar quotations could be given. Perhaps I have already cited too many of like nature, but I have done so merely to show the intensity and the scope of the belief of the arbitrariness and the discriminatory character of the provisions of the law.

The essence of the matter, then, is that the quota law of 1924 is bitterly attacked because it discriminates between races, or at least between nations. It increases the percentage from northern and western Europe, it decreases that from southern and eastern Europe, it restricts by nations or groups, whereas restriction, if any, should be individual.

The question of racial discrimination will be considered later. What, then, of this demand that restriction should be selective?

²¹ Chicago *Tribune*, May 27, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

2. THE CASE OF NOTED INDIVIDUALS

We have seen that the critics of the quota and literacy tests frequently assail them because they would have excluded certain notable immigrants. They would have kept out Michael Pupin, or the twelve apostles, or Charles Steinmetz. Practically every review I have seen of Pupin's autobiography points out rather sneeringly that this is the sort of man whom the modern Know-Nothings would exclude from America. One of them said, "One is tempted to ask how far he would have traveled and who would have taken his place in America had the immigration laws of to-day been in force forty-eight years ago." He himself says, "When I landed at Castle Garden, forty-eight years ago, I had only five cents in my pocket. I immediately spent it upon a piece of prune pie. . . . If present standards of immigration had prevailed forty-eight years ago, I should have been deported."

Mr. Edwin E. Slosson, in a review of the *Life of Charles Proteus Steinmetz* by J. W. Hammond, observed:

The late Dr. Steinmetz was one of the most valuable of such acquisitions. Not that he seemed such at first sight. In fact, under our present system of selective immigration, which is chiefly regulated by the map, the watch and the pocketbook, the penniless, ill-clad, and incoherent hunchback, who landed from the steerage at Castle Garden, June 1, 1889, would not have been admitted at all, and thereby the United States would have been many million dollars the poorer.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

And so it runs.

Much of this criticism is so emotional as to prove that it is very ill thought-out. In the first place, both Pupin and Steinmetz would have encountered the requirement that immigrants must satisfy the authorities that they would not become public charges. But that requirement is much older than either the literacy test or the quota law, and is purely selective. Because it may work harshly in two or three cases, however notable, is no reason why it should be repealed and allow millions of dependents to enter America. Once again, the opponents of restriction show their total inability to think in terms of millions. They are incurably individual in their thinking. Nor is there any reason to believe that both Pupin and Steinmetz could not have convinced our officials that they could earn their way, or have received financial assistance as many a poorer immigrant has done.

As for the literacy test, both could have passed it. As for the quota law, Mr. Steinmetz would have come in under the German quota which is the largest of all under the temporary 1890 basis of the 1924 Act and the second largest under the origins. Mr. Pupin might have had more trouble. Yet it is difficult to believe that his ability and energy would not have spurred him to persist in his determination long enough to obtain entrance under Yugoslavia's quota. Indeed, Yugoslavia's quota was not filled for the year 1925. The report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration for 1925 shows that the quota for Jugo-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

slavia was 671, whereas only 568 visas were granted and only 489 immigrants admitted.

But suppose these men had been excluded. It is certainly possible. It is also possible that the same law which excluded them would have excluded thousands or millions who would have been unwelcome elements in our midst, who would have failed to become Americans in the finest sense, who would have distorted our politics and twisted our institutions. Why should we insist on having all the genius of the world? It is no calamity if some of the genius of other lands contributes its genius to those lands. Surely in looking at the question in the large we must consider whether the enforcement of restrictions for America, cutting in great sweeps but aiming at mass results, is not worth the occasional loss to other countries of individuals we would otherwise like to have.

No one would deny the desirability of strict tests of individual fitness. On that point alone, apparently, in this generation-old discussion, is there agreement. There seems to be agreement, moreover, on our present tests of fitness, although there is no agreement on whether they are sufficient. But no one wants any diseased, epileptic, criminal or pauperized immigrants to enter the country.

When it is said, therefore, that we should select by individual tests, the question at once arises whether the present tests are sufficient, if rigidly enforced, or whether further tests are needed. The general assumption, even by the advocates of selective tests, is that our present tests are not sufficient.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

If they are not, what further tests should we have? The advocates of the selective tests have, as we have seen, the utmost scorn of the literacy test. It is a test of opportunity and not of worth, they declare. I have never been able to understand this point of view. I think it is only one more of a dozen examples which could be cited, where the advocates of free immigration glibly repeat certain stock phrases, such as "we need every healthy, moral immigrant we can get," that "tests should be of quality and not of quantity," that "the illiterate is often a better man than his literate neighbor."

3. THE LITERACY TEST AND INDIVIDUAL SELECTION

In fact, they rather assume that the illiterate is better potential material than the literate. They are fond of contrasting the sober, frugal but illiterate immigrant peasant from whose loins will spring inventors and scholars with the crudely-read degenerate, the sire of the Mafia of to-morrow. Their words, at least, imply a doubt of the value of education. It is not merely that the illiterate alien has never had an opportunity to educate himself, but they imply a regret that he will ever get that opportunity, for evidently as soon as he gets it, he will become "smart" and will no longer work for us and new illiterates must be imported. In the heat of the argument, at least, there is no recognition of the fact that half education with all its crudities is a necessary way-station on the road to fuller knowledge, and that not all illiterates are wise nor all literates un-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

balanced agitators. It is the old fatuous policy of Southern die-hards who would keep the negro perpetually ignorant and economically dependent. No argument should be required to characterize this age-old fallacy.

But even those who want the immigrant to have his chance are tainted with the old conception, for they repeat the glib assertion that education has nothing to do with worth. They repeat that they know many simple-hearted illiterates who are shrewd, kindly, and of greater intrinsic worth than many smart-aleck literates. Their favorite comparison is the village cobbler, full of wise saws and native wit and philosophy on the one hand, with a pasty-faced, degenerate corner loafer on the other.

Of course, they know such illiterates. But if the inference that they draw is correct, then our whole conception of education is wrong. If learning to read and write makes a man useless, discontented and a less desirable member of society, then we would do well to revise our educational policy of the past seventy-five years. It means that all our Americanization schools where the immigrants are taught to read and write are a mistake. Yet the very employers who talk of the excellence of the illiterate to the disparagement of the literate are most eager in seeing that the immigrant learns to read and write. Apparently they are eager to render him as inefficient as possible. But here is a sample of the results that are claimed for literacy. A circular of the Chicago Association of Commerce, advocating its Americani-

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

zation work, declared that the education of the foreign worker, "Reduces Accidents, Lessens Turnover, Greater Loyalty, Makes Real Citizens." It says:

You may expect these results:

A. Classes reduce frequency and severity of accidents and consequent time loss. Employees able to understand orders given in English—able to read safety signs written in English—are not as liable to accidents.

But what shall we say to those who want the immigrant to learn to read and write, but insist that it makes no difference whether he can read and write when he comes to us? This is the position that President Wilson took. It is held by almost all of the social workers who from the beginning of the immigration restriction controversy have always looked at immigration in terms of the individual. They think in terms of the appealing and lovable men and women and children whom they have known in their settlements. Never have they shown capacity to think in terms of millions, and of decades and generations. One or a dozen or a hundred shrewd and kindly illiterates may be human and appealing personalities, but three hundred thousand illiterates a year, not all shrewd and kindly, become at once a national problem—263,226 illiterates over the age of ten years entered the United States in the last year of full-flowing immigration before the literacy test was passed, the year ending June 30, 1914. If these numbers had still been allowed to obtain, we would, in the absence of a literacy test, have received three mil-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

lion illiterates in the past twelve years. If such illiteracy amounts to nothing, our whole common school system is founded on a false theory. It is founded on the theory that an illiterate electorate, an illiterate people, is unsafe. We can afford to give opportunity to the illiterate, but we cannot afford to give opportunity to three or four million illiterates every ten years.

The illiterate electorate in our cities is no small menace. According to the census of 1920, New York state had 383,862 illiterate foreign-born persons over twenty-one years of age; Illinois, 130,474; Massachusetts, 133,330. Chicago had 91,511, Cleveland, 30,678, and New York City, 266,663.

The army draft figures indicate that the actual figures of illiteracy are much greater than the census shows. It is notorious that the census taker, who receives the mere assertion of the house-dweller, will uncover only a fraction of the actual illiteracy. Common pride prompts great numbers to assert a literacy which does not exist at all, and to claim literacy when it extends to hardly more than the signature of one's name. The army psychological tests show that twenty-five percent of the draft army was illiterate.²² Half of the army illiterates were alien-born. There are no figures to show the proportion of the army which was foreign-born, but manifestly the alien proportion of army illiteracy was far greater than its proportion of the army.

Surely this is an appalling illiteracy for us blithely

²² National Museum of Sciences, *Memoirs*, Vol. 15, page 100.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

to say that to deny increase to it at the rate of 300,000 a year is contrary to the principles of America.

This is the illiterate electorate which every city machine works upon. The friends of the illiterate foreigner apply here the hoary trick of laying the blame for the success of the demagogue and the quack on the demagogue and the quack themselves, or indeed on the native-born from whom they spring. Always it is the fashion to blame the native-born for every failing of the immigrant. In like manner, we hear the bribe-giver loaded with all the blame and the bribe-taker held up as an innocent victim, sorely tempted by a cunning Satan. Of course, none of us will acquit the demagogue, the newspaper quack or the bribe-giver of an evil blow to our institutions. But no community will ever reach a state of perfection where it will not have demagogues, charlatans and quacks. As William James said in his speech, "The True Harvard": "But vice will never cease. Every level of culture breeds its own peculiar brand of it as surely as one soil breeds sugar cane, and another soil breeds cranberries."²³ The duty of the statesman is to give the demagoguery and quackery, which will always exist in some degree, as little material as possible to work upon. Yet without the literacy test, as fast as we educated the immigrants of to-day, we would receive a new mass of illiterates, so that we could never settle down to educate our citizenship without being undercut by new avalanches of illiteracy. A certain amount of illiteracy, in short, could

²³ James, *Memories and Studies*, p. 351.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

lion illiterates in the past twelve years. If such illiteracy amounts to nothing, our whole common school system is founded on a false theory. It is founded on the theory that an illiterate electorate, an illiterate people, is unsafe. We can afford to give opportunity to the illiterate, but we cannot afford to give opportunity to three or four million illiterates every ten years.

The illiterate electorate in our cities is no small menace. According to the census of 1920, New York state had 383,862 illiterate foreign-born persons over twenty-one years of age; Illinois, 130,474; Massachusetts, 133,330. Chicago had 91,511, Cleveland, 30,678, and New York City, 266,663.

The army draft figures indicate that the actual figures of illiteracy are much greater than the census shows. It is notorious that the census taker, who receives the mere assertion of the house-dweller, will uncover only a fraction of the actual illiteracy. Common pride prompts great numbers to assert a literacy which does not exist at all, and to claim literacy when it extends to hardly more than the signature of one's name. The army psychological tests show that twenty-five percent of the draft army was illiterate.²² Half of the army illiterates were alien-born. There are no figures to show the proportion of the army which was foreign-born, but manifestly the alien proportion of army illiteracy was far greater than its proportion of the army.

Surely this is an appalling illiteracy for us blithely

²² National Museum of Sciences, *Memoirs*, Vol. 15, page 100.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

to say that to deny increase to it at the rate of 300,000 a year is contrary to the principles of America.

This is the illiterate electorate which every city machine works upon. The friends of the illiterate foreigner apply here the hoary trick of laying the blame for the success of the demagogue and the quack on the demagogue and the quack themselves, or indeed on the native-born from whom they spring. Always it is the fashion to blame the native-born for every failing of the immigrant. In like manner, we hear the bribe-giver loaded with all the blame and the bribe-taker held up as an innocent victim, sorely tempted by a cunning Satan. Of course, none of us will acquit the demagogue, the newspaper quack or the bribe-giver of an evil blow to our institutions. But no community will ever reach a state of perfection where it will not have demagogues, charlatans and quacks. As William James said in his speech, "The True Harvard": "But vice will never cease. Every level of culture breeds its own peculiar brand of it as surely as one soil breeds sugar cane, and another soil breeds cranberries."²³ The duty of the statesman is to give the demagoguery and quackery, which will always exist in some degree, as little material as possible to work upon. Yet without the literacy test, as fast as we educated the immigrants of to-day, we would receive a new mass of illiterates, so that we could never settle down to educate our citizenship without being undercut by new avalanches of illiteracy. A certain amount of illiteracy, in short, could

²³ James, *Memories and Studies*, p. 351.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

be dissolved by the reactions set in motion by our schools, but wholesale illiteracy is a substance too stubborn for it to dissolve in the necessary time.

Finally, education in literacy is at best a halting process with the adult. An alien adult who cannot read or write his own language will perforce make but feeble progress with the English language and speech. To all true intents he will remain ignorant for the rest of his life. An influx of three or four hundred thousand illiterate aliens each year means, then, that perhaps half of that number each year will remain until death unable to read adequately the discussions of their country and the notices of their employers.

Though the literacy test was not meant primarily to be selective, I cannot admit that for the purposes of a great democracy it was not selective in the deepest sense.

4. NO SELECTIVE TESTS ARE SUGGESTED

The army intelligence test, or one based on it, has been suggested as a test for immigrants. But the opponents of restriction will have none of it. They declare that, like the literacy test, it is a test of opportunity and not of native ability; that those who have had their faculties developed by some education are more alert and more adaptable in responding either to the army Alpha or Beta tests, that is, respectively, the tests for literates and illiterates. It may be they are right. I am willing to admit that tests of mental ability are still in the experimental stage.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

But for us the main point is that the opponents of the quota law repeat the refrain that our tests should be selective, and yet they vehemently reject the only selective tests that have been proposed, except the standard tests of health, solvency, crime and sanity. I have yet to see any one of them offer a selective test of his own. Mr. Glenn Frank, now President of the University of Wisconsin, published an article in *Century*, when editor of that magazine, entitled, "A Sensible Immigration Policy."²⁴ In it he ridiculed the quota law and advocated a policy of scientific selection. He said that the Johnson bill of 1924, then under discussion, "adopts an arbitrary basis of calculation, such as the census of 1890, and an arbitrary percentage, such as two per cent. . . . There are several aspects of such a policy that lie open to serious criticism, but I desire to emphasize only the fact that it is inadequate as a permanent policy because it is arbitrary and mechanical." He then proceeded to show that what we needed was scientific selection and he elaborated on what scientific selection would do for us.

Yet nowhere in the article was there a suggestion of the method by which scientific selection should actually be applied.

The policy of restriction has now been before the American people for almost a generation. The first literacy test bill was vetoed by President Cleveland in 1897. Taft vetoed one in 1913. Wilson vetoed one in 1915 and another in 1917. The first quota law

²⁴ *Century Magazine*, May, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

was passed in 1921, the second in 1924, and we still hear that our tests should be selective and not arbitrary and yet no selective tests are proposed.

Surely we have a right to call on the opponents of restriction to propose their selective tests. The field is open.

5. PRESENT TESTS INADEQUATE

It is true that many men favor the present physical and mental tests, the tests of to-day without the literacy and quota provisions. Louis Marshall declared categorically before the Senate Committee in 1921, when asked if he favored any restriction on immigration: "My answer is that I am in favor of a restriction on immigration and you have it. . . . No person who is mentally, morally, or physically unfit; no person who would be a public charge; no person who would come to this country with the idea of not being faithful to the Constitution and laws of this country, should be admitted or is to be admitted to-day."²⁵

Mr. John R. Wiggins, Chairman of the Immigration Committee of the National Federation of Construction Industries, declared before the same Committee: "The hostility towards immigration is the result of our present laws not being properly enforced, for were they strictly enforced, quoting from the President of the National Association of Iron-molders of the United States 'we should have only

²⁵ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 113.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

immigrants of good moral character, physically sound, mentally competent, self-supporting and opposed to violence and revolution.'"²⁶ Apparently, then, as in so many fields, all we need is to enforce the laws we have.

How striking and persistent is this American belief that if our laws were only enforced all would be well. So it is with prohibition. It never seems to occur to many of us that there may be something the matter with a law that is not enforced, or rather that its enforcement may be subject to a host of pressing, disintegrating forces of opposition and frustration.

Certainly our laws have not kept out the unfit. Dr. H. H. Laughlin of the Carnegie Institution presented to the Congressional Committee in 1922 an elaborate study of the contribution of our foreign-born to custodial institutions. His figures were based on the census of 1910. He first determined for all aliens and for aliens of each nationality their quotas for each group of delinquency. Thus since aliens were 14.5% of our population, we would expect them to contribute 14.5% of each class of our delinquents. If 14.5% of any one class of all our delinquents is, for example, 1,000, then 1,000 is the alien quota for that class. Dr. Laughlin found that our aliens contributed 31% of their quota of our feeble-minded. Yet feeble-mindedness is congenital, and under a perfect enforcement of the law not a single feeble-minded alien would be admitted. The for-

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 257.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

eign-born contributed 29.8% of their quota of morons, and yet under perfect enforcement, of course, they would have contributed none. They contributed 225.76% of their quota of our insane, and while much insanity may have developed after entrance into this country, there is no doubt that much of this insanity should have been excluded at the ports. Likewise they contributed 193.6% of their quota of the maniac depressive group, 229.12% of the senile psychosis group, 86.4% of their quota of our criminals, 138.58% of their quota of our epileptics, 133.29% of their quota of our tuberculars, and 137.78% of their quota of our dependents.²⁷

Dr. Laughlin found that of a total of 210,835 in our institutions under one of his analyses, 44,587 were aliens. This survey covered only 67.73% of our institutions and, assuming the same ratio prevailed with those not reporting, the total alien membership would be about 65,000 out of a total 311,000. But Dr. Laughlin explained that the socially inadequate group found in institutions was, of course, not all of the socially inadequate. The institutions have a large turnover. He estimated that the total in the group was probably a million, of which probably 210,000 would therefore be alien. And yet our selection has not excluded them. Much of this contribution to our institutions and to our social defectives could have been prevented by thorough examinations at the ports of arrival.

²⁷ Hearings before House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Congress, 2d Session, November 21, 1922.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

6. SELECTION BREAKS DOWN UNDER THE PRESSURE OF NUMBERS

By this, I imply no criticism of our examining officers. They have worked under terrific pressure of numbers. In the last year of unrestricted immigration before the war, the year ending June 30, 1914, 1,218,480 immigrant aliens were admitted. In the year ending June 30, 1921 (which was one of free immigration except for the last month which was subject to the quota law of 1921), 805,228 immigrants were admitted. In the year ending June 30, 1924, in which the quota law of 1921 was in full effect, 706,896 immigrants were admitted. If we had had no quota law, there is no telling what the pressure would have been. Probably the number of applicants would have reached a million and a half or two millions a year. The evidence already presented of the pressure at consular offices in 1921 gives some hint of the pressure that would have surged against the examining officers.

No officials can properly work under such pressure. Mr. Henry H. Curran, Commissioner at Ellis Island, declared in a speech at the New York Town Hall on January 24, 1924, "We cannot properly say who should come in and who should not, when they come in such droves, that we are compelled to inspect them at the rate of an immigrant a minute."²⁸

Dr. Spencer L. Dawes, Medical Examiner of the New York State Hospital Commission, speaking on

²⁸ *New York Times*, January 25, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

April 21, 1924, at an institute of occupational therapists, flatly said that the law was not being enforced.

It is broken every hour of every day by the Federal officials. I have told them so and they are unable to deny it. I do not blame the officials at Ellis Island—they do the best they can—but I do blame the laxity of Congress.

The law provides every immigrant shall be examined by two physicians concerning his mental and physical fitness for admission. I was at Ellis Island recently and saw 540 come off a barge and pass through the examination at the rate of eight a minute. I followed one of these immigrants through the customs and it took twenty-seven minutes to examine his baggage to see if he had anything dutiable. But he was passed by the doctor in a little over seven seconds. It is the fault of Congress for not providing enough money. They haven't written up their card index on Ellis Island for five years because they haven't enough help.

We have 41,000 insane in our State institutions, which were built to hold 28,000, and 25% of them are aliens who have no right here and who have been permitted to enter through the laxity of the Federal officials. . . .

According to the report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, 4,200 aliens were admitted under bond in 1922 by order of the Secretary of Labor after the doctors had excluded them. In 98 percent of the cases neither the aliens nor their bondsmen could be found.²⁹

Selection, in short, breaks down before two inherent and overwhelming defects—the terrific pressure of numbers and the frailty of human examiners. Any one who served in the national army knows how uncertain and variable under human application the

²⁹ *New York Times*, April 22, 1924.

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

fairly definite physical tests of the army became. It was a matter of bitter complaint by many of the first recruits that they had been accepted by the examiner for the draft, while they had been rejected by examiners for the first officers' training camp. It was partly because the examining for the draft was done in a hurry, as the examining of immigrants is done in a hurry. It was largely because doctors and examiners disagree, because despite all the academic talk of scientific selection, and of impartial bases for selection, all selection is, after all, individual, and depends on the individual bias of the examiner. The immigrant now rejected under the quota, as he thinks arbitrarily, might be rejected under scientific selection just as arbitrarily. As far as arbitrariness is concerned, what difference is there if I am rejected because I am number 7,000 or because Doctor A rejects me after fifteen seconds' examination, while Doctor B would have passed me? The arbitrariness of error is as arbitrary as the arbitrariness of number.

Selection can never work, therefore, unless the number to be examined be first reduced to workable proportions. Two million immigrants might very well apply every year were the quota and literacy tests removed. Even if we could admit a million immigrants, all of them physically, mentally and financially admissible under the old laws, we could not winnow out the 100,000 unadmissibles in such a mass. Assuming that we want reduction in numbers, as I shall try to show later on, the selective tests offer no means for reducing the numbers by half or one-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

third. They offer no means of picking the physically and mentally unfit out of the vast number of applicants. There is no qualitative test suggested for preferring A to B or C. The essence of qualitative selection requires quantitative reduction.

The only suggestion made is that the examinations be made abroad. It is suggested that our examiners abroad go into family histories, study their personal characteristics, and make the rejection there. We have already begun to make examinations abroad, largely with a view to saving immigrants the expense and anguish of coming all the way to this country only to be rejected. The Department of Labor reports favorably on the start of this procedure. A careful examination of the actual working of the plan, from unbiased sources, would be essential, however, before any valid opinion of its efficiency could be hazarded. But it is not unfair to surmise that removing the examinations to Europe will not repeal the ordinary workings of the human element in the making of examinations. Indeed, the farther removed the officials making the examinations are from the government that employs them, the less likely are they to maintain a rigid system of inspection.

Nor can we forget that many men in the consular offices will be typical bureaucrats. They will be working far from home and without the stimulus and discipline of frequent contact with the head office. Any one who knows anything of how officials will

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

work under such conditions, knows how slovenly their work can be.

But we must not forget that the examinations now are conducted under a far different plan from what would obtain if the quota law were repealed. Now the immigrants are subject to the quota law. Only a limited number can apply, and the registration numbers are filled up in some countries far in advance. The examining officers, in such countries, have only to keep the registrations moving fast enough, and have, comparatively speaking, ample time to make their selections for the next numbers.

If there were no restrictions of a quota, however, the examiners would be forced to examine a constant stream of applicants. Each consular office would be in its degree an Ellis Island. Suppose under these circumstances all that we desire is to make sure of the enforcement of our present physical, mental and financial requirements. We might have 100,000 a year applying at one consular office and only a few hundred at another. The first would be subject to all the difficulties of Ellis Island. The pressure would be too great for efficiency. It might let large numbers of immigrants through its tests which the second office, having more time, would reject. Yet the few hundred at the second office might be all superior to the one hundred thousand at the first office. How are we to synchronize the examiners and see that their tests harmonize?

As for the examination into the family histories and character of immigrants, it is clear that that task,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

even if performed conscientiously, would lend itself to the utmost of subjective variation. No one can say what the objective tests of character are. Selection on the basis of character without objective tests, would, especially when applied by many men, widely separated, handling thousands of cases, be decided in most cases by the intuition, the "hunches" of the examiners and the grossest inequality and confusion would result. The less physical tests become, the more subjective they become. The more subjective they become, the more arbitrary they become.

If it is conceived that some such system will operate appreciably to reduce numbers, the fallacy is at once apparent. If we say to a consular officer that he is to pass only a certain number of applicants a year, we at once have the quota system. If we say to him that he is to pass the best fifty thousand, we still have a quota system, and leave to subjective determination the method of determining who are the best.

And, as we have seen, the present physical and mental tests do not conduce to the reduction of numbers. In the year ending June 30, 1921, which was, save for the last month, the last year of the old immigration, 805,228 immigrants were admitted. Only 13,779 were debarred. Even if we assume that perfect inspection would have excluded all the aliens whom Dr. Laughlin in 1922 found to be delinquent, about 210,000, it is clear that it would not reduce numbers. In the forty years from 1880 to 1920, during which probably these 210,000 delinquents came

THE FALLACY OF SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

to America, our immigration was 23,465,374³⁰ and our net immigration 16,537,000.³¹ Perfect selection would have reduced the number who came less than ten per cent, and of course perfect selection is impossible both because of the human element, the nature of the conditions under which examinations are made, and moreover the further fact that much delinquency develops after the aliens have been long in America.

Summarizing this discussion of selective tests, we can fairly say, therefore, that our present tests are not excluding all of the unfit and that, if they were, they would make little inroads on numbers. Selective tests cannot work if jarred by the constant pressure of numbers. If they are made more severe, they will become more subjective, and, therefore, in the hands of hundreds of examiners, not all of the highest capacity, more arbitrary. No method has yet been suggested for applying selective tests by which numbers could be reduced.

³⁰ Report of Commissioner-General of Immigration, 1926, p. 168.

³¹ Increase of Population in the United States, 1910-1920, p. 204.

CHAPTER IV

RESTRICTION AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

I. REDUCTION IN NUMBERS THE MAIN MOTIVE

WE ARE now ready to consider the quota law for what it claims to be. Above all, it claims and aims to reduce numbers. When it is attacked as not selective, while we might show (as I have tried to show) that selective tests are not adequate and will not work under pressure of numbers, we could be satisfied merely by replying that the quota law does not aim to select. It aims to reduce numbers. The literacy test aimed to reduce numbers. I have tried to show that for the purposes of our democracy the literacy test was, after all, roughly selective, since no democracy could endure the yearly inroad of 300,000 or 400,000 illiterates, most of them of voting age. But the literacy test was not designed to select individuals, and all the arguments of its opponents that it was not selective missed the mark. Macauley complained that the defenders of Charles the First, when told that he had debauched the administration of the country, answered that he was good to his family and said his prayers every day. The answer could hardly be more unresponsive than that of the opponents of the literacy test that it is not selective. It *is* roughly selective, but it was not passed as a selective measure.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

It was intended to reduce numbers and primarily numbers from southern and eastern Europe. Senator Dillingham, referring to the literacy law, stated before the Senate Committee in 1921: "That was very much misunderstood in the country. The great majority of the people, I think, looked upon it as a quality test, rather than a purely restrictive measure, as it was intended to be by those who proposed it."¹

The quota laws of 1921 and 1924 were also not intended as selective. They were primarily intended to reduce numbers and particularly numbers from southern and eastern Europe. The question is solely whether it was desirable to reduce numbers, and particularly numbers from southern and eastern Europe.

2. THE REASON FOR REDUCING NUMBERS—THE THREATENED SUBMERGENCE OF OUR COLONIAL STOCK

What, then, did the country face in 1921 when the first quota law went into effect?

The discussion of immigration seems full of catchy half-truths. Quality not quantity, selection and not restriction, literacy is not a test of fitness, the American won't do common labor—we have seen how misleading they all are. But on the subject of our national origins and the nature of our nation, confusion is worse confounded. We are told that America was formed out of the melting-pot. Out of heterogeneity she came and with heterogeneity she

¹ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 465.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

should continue. Even so careful an historian as Max Farrand of Yale says:

It was a heterogeneous mass that was there assembled. Mingling with the English settlers from the start there had been some French, Germans, Swedes, Welsh, Scotch-Irish and others, while the Dutch formed a separate and not insignificant element by themselves. Then toward the close of the eighteenth century, because of unsatisfactory conditions at home, Germans, Swiss and Scotch-Irish poured into the colonies by tens, hundreds and by thousands.²

All but the first sentence is strictly true but certainly the general impression it gives is that the United States was a heterogeneous mass composed about equally of English, Scotch-Irish, French, Germans, Swedes and Dutch. Certainly that is the popular impression. The common belief is that America has always been a mosaic of many nations with none of them predominating. The truth is exactly the opposite. This country began with a unified population. It was almost nine-tenths English, Scotch, Scotch-Irish and Welsh, that is, British, at the time the nation was formed. The Census Bureau's study, *A Century of Population Growth*, published in 1909, estimated that in 1790, at the time of the first census, our population was made up as shown on page 91.

The English and Scotch comprised, therefore, 89.1% of the population. In some states the English-Scotch percentages were greater. In Maine the English and Scotch were 97.4%; in New Hampshire,

² Farrand, *The Development of the United States*, p. 12.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

Total white.....	3,172,444	
English.....	2,605,699	82.1%
Scotch.....	221,562	7.0
Irish.....	61,534	1.9
Dutch.....	78,959	2.5
French.....	17,619	.6
German.....	176,407	5.6
Hebrew.....	1,243	
All other.....	9,421	.3

98.8% ; in Vermont, 98.4% ; Massachusetts, 98.6% ; Rhode Island, 99.1% ; Connecticut, 99% ; Virginia, 92.1% ; North Carolina, 94.3% ; South Carolina, 94.1% ; Maryland, 90.5% ; Georgia, 94.3% ; Kentucky, 94.3% , and Tennessee, 94.3% . In New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey the other nationalities were more heavily represented and that fact has led us to believe that because there were Germans, Swedes and Dutch in the Middle Colonies, that the colonies as a whole were mixed.³ It is the old story of the minister's son who is a ne'er-do-well. His record so colors his class that the average person believes that all ministers' sons are ne'er-do-wells although the statistics show that their percentage of success is far above the average.

Our population at the beginning was, therefore, remarkably homogeneous. Moreover, it lived here together subject to common experiences for over two hundred years before any great diverse immigration began to come, that of the South Irish about 1844 and the German about 1848. Save in the case of

³ *A Century of Population Growth*, 1909, p. 121.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

some of the Pennsylvania Germans and the French in Louisiana, who have remained in separate, somewhat isolated, groups, our colonial stock has become remarkably one through long intermarriage largely within its own group, a homogeneous national stock with a common heritage and past. Indeed, this original homogeneity, this close-knit and well-intrenched common experience and tradition alone have made possible the maintenance of our nation amid all the pressure of ninety years' immigration of alien stocks.

But beginning with the great Irish and German influxes came more alien peoples, partly of different speech, and for the most part unacquainted with our political development. This immigration, like all immigration, was for the first generation at least more prolific than the native stock, and its annual increment by immigration and its increase by birth steadily cut down the percentage of the old colonial stock. Between 1820 and 1830 the total immigration was 151,284; between 1831 and 1840 it was 591,125; between 1841 and 1850 it was 1,713,251; between 1851 and 1860 it was 2,598,214; between 1861 and 1870 it was 2,314,824; between 1871 and 1880 it was 2,812,191; between 1881 and 1890 it was 5,246,613; between 1890 and 1900 it was 3,687,564, and between 1900 and 1910 it was 8,795,386.

About 1890 the immigration, which had been largely from northern and western Europe, began to change its character. The greater part of it began to come from eastern and southern Europe. In the

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

decade 1861-1870 only 1.6% of our European immigration came from eastern and southern Europe; in 1871-1880, 8.8%; in 1881-1890, 22%; in 1891-1900 the percentage was 53%, and in 1901-1910, 76% of a total immigration of 8,213,410 from Europe.

By 1920 there were 13,712,754 foreign-born white persons in America, and 15,694,539 both of whose parents were foreign-born. In short, 31% of our white population was foreign-born or the children of foreign-born.

Our foreign-born population did not increase greatly in the decade ending in 1920. The war hindered immigration greatly in that period. But in the decade ending in 1910 our immigration came at the rate of a million a year. In that decade our Italian-born population increased 860,000; our Russian-born, more than 750,000. In 1910, there were 1,341,164 persons born in Austria-Hungary living in the United States; 1,343,175, born in Italy; 2,311,337, born in Germany; 1,352,251, born in Ireland.

In 1920, although immigration had been seriously interrupted for six years by the war, there were in the United States 1,686,108 persons born in Germany; 1,139,979, in Poland; 1,400,495, in Russia; 1,610,113, in Italy; and 1,037,234, in Ireland.

In New York State in 1920, the percentage of the white population which was native-born of native parentage was but 36; in Massachusetts, 32.4; in New Jersey, 41.3; in Connecticut, 33; in North Dakota, 32.4; in Rhode Island, 29.2, and even in New Hampshire, but 51.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

In the cities, of course, the percentages were worse. In Boston it was 24.9; in Buffalo, 32.9; Chicago, 24; Cleveland, 27.9; Fall River, 16; Hartford, 30.2; Jersey City, 30; Lowell, 21.9; Milwaukee, 28.8; New Bedford, 17.3; New Haven, 28.1; Philadelphia, 41.4; Pittsburgh, 39; Providence, 27.5; Rochester, 38; St. Paul, 33.5; San Francisco, 34.1; Worcester, 28.4; Youngstown, 37, and St. Louis, 51.

In the New England cities the descendants of the colonial stock must be a mere fringe. There are no statistics available to show exactly what their proportion is.

One who lives in Chicago, if he has any sensitiveness at all, is constantly impressed by the rawness, the heterogeneity and confusion of the population. The *Chicago Daily News* headed an article in its issue of December 29, 1924, reporting an address by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart before the American Statistical Association: "Statistics Show City is Real Melting-Pot. For each 2 Native White coming in 1910-1920, 5 negroes, 12 foreigners came." The Chicago Association of Commerce has prepared a map by wards showing the percentage in each ward of the principal nationalities. In the 9th ward but 17% is of native parentage; in the 8th ward, 17.6%; in the 29th ward, 16%; in the 34th ward, 11%; in the 12th ward, 10%, and in the 2nd, 11.86%.

To show how conglomerate is the racial mixture, a list of the surnames in the graduation list of one of the high schools is most striking.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

Bartels	Goldman	Lipschin	Roberts
Benjamin	Goodman	Lipshulz	Rodman
Bielinski	Goldstein	Mayer	Rosen
Blank	Gorsky	McNair	Rosenthal
Bluestein	Greenberg	Meyer	Roth
Borash	Gross	Meyers	Sass
Brandt	Hechter	Missner	Schatz
Carr	Holtzman	Moffic	Schultz
Cohen	Horwich	Morris	Shane
Cowen	Horwitz	Moscovitz	Skolnok
Douglis	Isaac	Natkin	Silber
Einstein	Jacobson	Natkin	Silverstein
Emmerman	Jacobson	Neiburger	Sohn
Englander	Katch	Noskin	Sokoloff
Ernststein	Kleiman	Passman	Stein
Feinberg	Kolovsky	Pikowsky	Sternberg
Fingold	Kravitz	Poppic	Stevenson
Fishman	Kunin	Poticha	Stone
Fox	Kurzband	Rainville	Swartz
Freilich	Lazar	Ravid	Twery
Fried	Lee	Reeder	Walker
Friedman	Leone	Resnikoff	Yavitz
Ginsberg	Lerner	Rickover	Ziven
Goldman	Liebling	Riskind	Zucher
	Linn	Rivkin	

The Census Bureau's estimate in 1922 was that but 49.9% of our total population was descended from the 1790 stock. This proportion has steadily declined. I give below the total white population of the country for each decade beginning in 1820, with its estimate of the 1790 stock each decade, and the percentage of the latter to the former.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Decade	Total White	1790 Stock	Percentage
1820.....	7,862,166	7,590,000	96.5
1830.....	10,537,378	10,010,000	94.9
1840.....	14,195,805	12,880,000	90.7
1850.....	19,553,068	16,120,000	82.4
1860.....	26,922,537	19,790,000	73.5
1870.....	33,589,377	23,420,000	61.7
1880.....	43,402,970	27,820,000	64.09
1890.....	55,101,258	32,410,000	58.8
1900.....	66,809,196	37,290,000	55.8
1910.....	81,731,957	42,420,000	51.9
1920.....	94,820,915	47,330,000	49.9

The figures for the years 1820-1890 inclusive were ascertained by the Census Bureau on what it calls an alternative method; the figures for 1900, 1910 and 1920 on the original method. The alternative method figures for 1900 is 37,300,000; for 1910 42,450,000, and for 1920 47,370,000. (See Increase of Population in the United States, 1910-1920, pp. 187-196.)

In 1924 Captain Trevor presented estimates of the distribution by origin of our 94,820,000 white population as the basis of his estimates of quotas above referred to. His table is shown on pages 98 and 99.

In other words, of our present white population of 94,820,000, he found that only 49,086,402, or 51.7%, traces to a stock that has been in this country as long as one hundred years. This population through its long residence here and intermarriage with others of the same stock may fairly be called homogeneous. It is the old American stock. The remainder of the

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

white population is divided between those of British origin since 1790, which is 8% of our white population; Canadian, which is 3.7%; Irish, 5.3%; Russian, 2.5%; Swedish, 1.9%; Norwegian, 1.3%; with smaller percentages for Jugoslavs, Greeks, Hungarians, Finns, Danes, Lithuanians and Latvians—a conglomerate country surely.

The Presidential Commission, which prepared the quota estimates for the 1924 act, alters somewhat the Trevor figures. It has not published its estimates of the divisions of the present population by origins, but it follows from the quotas it arrives at that the percentage of British is somewhat reduced and that of the Irish, Germans, Poles and Italians somewhat increased. This is undoubtedly largely due to the fact that it finds that the present strength of the 1790 stock is only 41,288,570, whereas the Census Bureau's monograph in 1922 put it at 47,330,000. This is because the experts for the Commission did not accept the Census Bureau's basis that the rate of increase of the original and later stocks was the same. The result is to decrease the British stock from about 55% of our total white population, as estimated by Trevor, to about 46%, as estimated by the Presidential Commission. One person in the quota represents 601 in the population, that is, that for every 601 persons here in 1920, originating in any one country, that country gets one immigrant. As the quota of Great Britain and North Ireland was fixed at 73,039, it follows that there are according to his estimates 43,896,439 persons of British origin in the United

AN ANALYSIS OF THE POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES¹

based upon the 1920 census

Country of Birth	Descendants of Colonial Stock enumerated in 1st Census, 1790, and descendants of arrivals between 1790-1820 (Numerical Equivalent)	Foreign White Stock Foreign Born; Native Born of Foreign Parentage and Native Born of Mixed Parentage	Native Born of Native Parentage contributed by arrivals between 1820-1900 (Numerical Equivalent)	Colored Races	TOTAL
Albania.....		7,461			7,461
Armenia.....		44,042	899		44,941
Austria.....		1,249,852	66,241		1,316,093
Belgium.....		132,195	17,498		149,693
Bulgaria.....		14,485			14,485
Czechoslovakia.....		783,946	41,774		825,720
Danzig.....		15,066	2,679		17,745
Denmark.....		511,906	64,078		575,984
Estonia.....		196,187	4,043		200,230
Finland.....		302,931	6,548		309,479
Fiume.....		875	51		926
France.....	294,518	556,202	231,679		1,082,399
Germany.....	2,768,473	6,779,598	2,625,303		12,173,374
Great Britain and North Ireland.....	44,017,828	4,875,370	2,854,482		51,747,680
Irish Free State.....	650,798	2,991,273	1,421,895		5,063,966
Greece.....		236,150	1,091		237,241
Hungary.....		854,816	45,917		900,733
Iceland.....		6,351			6,351
Italy.....		3,365,261	107,196		3,472,457
Latvia.....		224,213	4,673		228,886
Lithuania.....		272,259	7,817		280,076
Luxemburg.....		49,600	3,601		53,201
Netherlands.....	1,227,160	383,568	67,735		1,678,463
Norway.....		1,063,147	187,548		1,250,695
Poland.....		2,675,878	83,163		2,759,041

[98]

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Portugal.....	
Rumania.....	
Russia.....	
Spain.....	
Sweden.....	127,
Switzerland.....	
Yugoslavia.....	
San Marino.....	
Andorra.....	
Liechtenstein.....	
Monaco.....	
Palestine.....	
Syria.....	
Turkey.....	
Hejaz.....	
Persia.....	
Egypt.....	
Liberia.....	
Abyssinia.....	
Morocco.....	
Union of South Africa.....	
Australia.....	
New Zealand and Pacific Islands.....	
Canada.....	
Newfoundland.....	
West Indies.....	
Mexico.....	
Central and South America.....	
Black.....	
Mulatto.....	
Indians.....	
Chinese.....	
Japanese.....	
All others.....	
TOTAL.....	49,086,

‘ An Analysis of the American Immigration Act of 1924, John Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

.....	137,399	13,216		150,615
.....	138,266	1,091		139,357
.....	2,362,247	72,422		2,434,669
.....	83,756	9,336		93,092
625	1,521,153	218,574		1,867,352
.....	374,611	99,929		474,540
.....	345,284	16,522		361,806
.....	1,010	32		1,042
.....				
.....				
.....	5,382			5,382
.....	87,733			87,733
.....	25,243	1,091		26,334
.....	359			359
.....	1,974			1,974
.....	2,241			2,241
.....				
.....				
.....	1,245			1,245
.....	28,020	5,241		33,261
.....	9,714			9,714
.....	2,703,055	793,998		3,497,053
.....	27,565	6,301		33,866
.....	47,872	22,634		70,506
.....	726,463	72,808		799,271
.....	21,833	12,183		34,016
.....				8,802,577
.....				1,660,554
.....				244,437
.....				61,639
.....				111,010
.....	153,901	144,266		307,655
402	36,398,958	9,335,555	10,889,705	105,710,620

John B. Trevor. Published in issue of September, 1924, International Conciliation,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

States. The figures for the chief countries, ascertained on the same basis, are as follows:

Austria.....	892,086
Czecho-Slovakia.....	1,351,048
Belgium.....	246,410
Denmark.....	627,444
France.....	2,306,036
Great Britain and North Ireland.....	43,896,439
Greece.....	220,201
Hungary.....	581,167
Netherlands.....	1,445,021
Norway.....	1,362,467
Poland.....	2,991,778
Russia.....	2,873,381
Sweden.....	1,958,655
Germany.....	14,080,228
Irish Free State.....	8,331,062
Italy.....	3,660,691

In other words, the Presidential Commission finds a more heterogeneous population than Captain Trevor found.

With the country steadily becoming more conglomerate in population, we were faced with a great post-war influx of immigration. The Senatorial Committee, which held hearings in 1921 on the immigration question, called for reports from the State Department of the prospects of immigration. The report stated, among other things:

It is estimated that 2,000,000 Germans desire to emigrate to the United States if passport restrictions are removed.⁵

⁵ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, p. 10.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

Approximately 100,000 persons are desirous of immediately leaving Poland, for the purpose of coming to the United States. Ninety-five percent of these persons are of the very lowest classes of the country and are considered to be thoroughly undesirable.⁶

A report of May 17, 1920, from Poland estimated that:

One immigrant aid society which has offices in Poland, is said to be planning to send 2,500,000 emigrants of one race alone, the Jewish, to the United States within the next three years.⁷

A report of October 1 stated:

It is estimated that 350,000 Polish subjects of the Hebrew race alone are anxious to proceed to the United States for the purpose of joining relatives or for other reasons.

A report of December 15 from Warsaw was to the effect that:

At least 350,000 Polish Jews and Poles are preparing to proceed to the United States during the current year. Some estimates place the total at 500,000 and 1,000,000 as the number of persons who may emigrate.

The report from Italy, from Catania, was that:

Approximately 10,000 persons have obtained visés and are now waiting opportunity to emigrate to the United States. It is estimated 100,000 or more persons want to come to America.

From Naples:

It is estimated that 76,000 persons are waiting opportunity to emigrate to the United States.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The estimate for Palermo was 50,000.⁸

The report of Secretary Hughes, submitted to the House in April, 1921, added that, "it may be accepted as nearly literally true that every Armenian family which has enough money to get away, or is not impregnated with Bolshevism, will ultimately endeavor to emigrate to America. Russians and Georgians are likely more and more to emigrate to the same haven."⁹

Pages of similar testimony could be added. It is true that the friends of liberal immigration discounted these reports. But it would seem that since in 1921, the last year of free immigration, the influx was 805,228, and in 1924 after the business depression had passed and despite the quota law of 1921, which was still in effect, 706,896 immigrants entered, that those who reported a great tide ready to come were correct. Indeed, it is impossible successfully to doubt the actual evidence of applications for passports made. If there had been no quota laws, it is probable that the only limit would have been the limit that liberal immigrationists so frequently refer to, the limit of steamship capacity.

It takes only a little imagination to see that if immigration had been allowed to come in pre-war quantities, to say nothing of greater than pre-war quantities, the old dominant stock of the country was doomed. "The Birth Registration Area" report for 1923 shows that the birth-rate for native-born mothers was 3 per mother; for foreign-born mothers,

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-15.

⁹ *New York Times*, April 20, 1921.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

4. The number of children living for native-born mothers was 2.8 and for foreign-born mothers, 3.4.¹⁰ There is reason to believe that for similar economic classes, the second and third generation of immigrants have no higher birth-rates than the older stock. But with continuing immigration, the first generation is always of a higher birth-rate than the native stock, it drives the native stock out of the lower classes of employment, and automatically the birth-rate of those pushed into a different economic level decreases. As long as heavy immigration continues, this differential will work against the existence of the native stock, for every nation tends to breed faster in the lower economic classes than in the high. If, however, the native stock were in the lower economic classes, the differential in favor of the lower economic classes would have no tendency to eliminate the native stock. The continuance of heavy immigration means, therefore, a continuation of the differential birth-rate in favor of the immigrant stocks, and the steady decline of the native stock. It means also the steady decline of the earlier immigrant stocks, the Germans, Irish, Swedes and Norwegians. Eventually, under free immigration, they would all be pushed to the wall, so that in the end the country would belong to the latest immigrant groups—to Italians, Greeks, Poles, Bohemians and Slavs. In a hundred years, our country might have been composed but ten percent of the old stock and the other ninety percent in about equal proportions of Ger-

¹⁰ Birth Registration Area Report, 1923, p. 15.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

mans, Irish, Italians, Greeks, Russians, Poles, Jews and Slavs from the Balkans. Our whole country might have become what Chicago and New York are to-day.

The old-stock American, in short, saw himself being crowded out of the country which his ancestors founded, which they had fought for in war after war, which as pioneers they had built up in the great Middle and Far West. This is not to deny other racial groups their share in the great achievements of the past, but naturally, if for no other reason than its heavy numerical preponderance up to 1880 or 1890, the old colonial stock bore the heaviest burden.

I am convinced that the main force back of the quota laws was not economic pressure, was not the outcry of American labor, but was a deep, pervading, half-articulate instinct animating the old stock, that it must act to keep itself from being pushed to extinction.

But we are told that this is racial selfishness—the country belongs to the world and no one race or group of nations has a right to monopolize it. Surely the newer immigrant groups who protest so bitterly against the quota law, can hardly consistently complain of selfishness. They are doing their utmost to obtain the country for themselves. It is not for them to cry selfishness at those who are trying to keep it for themselves, even if so bald a statement is fair to the native stock. It is not for the newcomers, who too often jeer at and ridicule the native stock, to cry selfishness at those who have centuries of traditions

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

and toil and blood spent for it to give them a right to cherish its preservation for those of their own blood. It is not for the newer comers, who are trying to prevent the partial exclusion of their own blood, to criticize the native stock for trying to prevent the practical extinction of its own blood—not by war, not by legislation, but by the remorseless, ruthless competition, never ending and never sparing, with racial groups of lower standards of living from other parts of the world who will never cease to pour in on us unless prevented by force until the country is filled up to the saturation point.

Let us bring the matter to a concrete issue in an endeavor to show those of other countries that under similar circumstances their countries would do the same as we have done. Suppose Italy had 20,000,000 people and that the limit of her population was 40,000,000—her actual population to-day. Then suppose only 10,000,000 of Italy's 20,000,000 was Italian and 10,000,000 was composed of people of twenty different races. The friends of the immigrants may object to the comparison of Italians with Americans because they assert that every one here is an American, whereas they would admit that every one in Italy might not be Italian. It is so much easier to become an American than an Italian. To meet their objection, then, let us merely assume that but 10,000,000 of those in Italy were of one racial stock and had lived in Italy as long as one hundred years, and 10,000,000 were of twenty races who had been in Italy for periods from

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

one to one hundred years—most of them less than fifty years. Would Italy then allow 200,000 immigrants a year, 80% of them from twenty different races alien to her homogeneous 10,000,000 until the 40,000,000 limit was reached and Italy was one-third homogeneous and two-thirds of twenty different races? Hungary has 8,000,000 of whom 7,000,000 are Hungarians. Would Hungary, if her limit was 15,000,000, let 80,000 a year come in, three-fourths from a dozen different nationalities, until the limit was reached and Hungary was only one-half homogeneous? I venture to say that Italy would not do it. Hungary would not do it; no nation would consider doing it but the United States.

3. THE LIMIT OF POPULATION

I have found few persons of the old stock who denounce the quota laws who have ever faced this future. They think of the country as capable of limitless expansion in population. As we have seen, they think a billion is our probable limit. They are fond of imagining magical methods of food production which will enable untold myriads to dwell in the land. I have already alluded to Professor East's thorough study and deflation of these gorgeous dreams. Perhaps it would be well here to quote him more particularly. Briefly, he bases his argument on the fact that in this country there were, in 1910, 478,000,000 acres of improved land supporting a population of 100,000,000. The total available acreage of improved land operated under the same con-

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

ditions is only 800,000,000. If, therefore, that acreage were fully operated with the same efficiency, the country would support 167,000,000. But he argues that "if, then, it be admitted that the best land was taken first, and that presumably the 67 percent additional is only half as good as what is now under cultivation, which to an agriculturalist is a reasonable assumption, it follows that on a productivity basis, just about 35 percent can be added to our present holdings."

Roughly speaking, 100 million people are supported comfortably now, and 135 million people can be supported eventually by the agricultural efficiency at present in sway. The obvious conclusion is that the present productivity must be increased by just 50 percent if even the population predicted by Pearl [197 millions] is given the food standard of living to which the people are now accustomed.¹¹

There is not space here to go into the argument by which it is held that 800,000,000 acres is the limit of tillable ground. It is based on a careful study by O. E. Baker and H. W. Strong, appearing in the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture for 1918, entitled "Arable Land in the United States." To feed 331,000,000 people, or double the amount under present standards if all the acreage is used, it "will be necessary to double the present production on every acre of available land, and to keep the production continuously on this basis." If, then, we are to feed and support any such population, it is clear that we

¹¹ E. M. East, *Mankind at the Crossroads*, p. 156.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

shall do so only by applying much greater labor and expense to each acre, in short by increasingly diminishing returns and steadily decreasing standards of living.

Professor East inclines rather to the view that the limit is closer to 197,000,000, the figure arrived at by Professor Pearl, though he hopes that the country may wake in time to the situation and work to a limit of 135,000,000 or thereabouts.

Professor Pearl arrives at his conclusions by an intricate mathematical calculation, entirely too difficult to elaborate here. Suffice it to say that he believes that every country's population follows a definite mathematical curve whose future, once the past has been plotted, can be predicted with reasonable accuracy. He puts the limit for the United States at 197.3 millions.

There is no need here to enter into these speculations in detail. They are presented far more ably than I can hope to do in the studies of Professors East and Pearl. It is enough for us that there is at least excellent reason to believe that our limit is nearer two hundred million than any fanciful figure of three or five times as large. If it is two hundred million, it is clear that every immigrant we take in has an excellent chance of having himself represented in that two hundred million. We have something over 110,000,000 now. Of these, perhaps ten millions are colored, and of the whites somewhere between 48,500,000 and 55,000,000 are descendants of the

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

colonial stock or the British stock that has come since. Following the argument of Professor Walker, it is clear that immigration never increases the size of the population of a nation. It simply changes its content. If ten millions of immigrants are received, they simply displace ten millions of the native stock. So it must be clearly understood that every immigrant we add displaces an American-born. We may wish or be willing to do that, but there should be no mistake as to what we are doing. The result, then, of taking immigration with its higher birth-rate at a million or two million a year for thirty years would undoubtedly mean that most of our increase up to two hundred millions would be made up of immigrants. The old stock, which is now one-half of our white population, would then be a fourth or a fifth or perhaps even less. And, of course, if those who believe that we can support 500,000,000 in this country are correct, the prospect is even worse. If the limit is 200,000,000, then if the colonial stock maintains its strength it would be one-fourth of the total. If the limit is 500,000,000 and the colonial stock maintains its strength, it will be one-tenth of the total.

When we ask those of the old stock who are opposed to the quota laws if they would like to see their own blood wiped out as if by an invading army, they are usually shocked at the unconsidered prospect and admit that it is abhorrent to them to think that their children's children will live in a land alien to that their fathers knew.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

4. SHOULD WE ALLOW THE OLD STOCK TO BE SUBMERGED?

But there are others of the native stock who claim a greater broad-mindedness. They declare that America belongs to those with the will to survive and that the ideals and institutions of America can be carried on as well by the later arrivals as by the representatives of the old stock. They declare that if the old colonial stock will not sacrifice in order to bear and rear children, it deserves to lose its place to healthier and more vigorous peoples. I agree with them, were its survival a mere question of the will to survive. But at present the colonial stock is meeting unfair competition. The earlier immigrant stock, the South Irish, the German and the Scandinavian, is meeting the same competition. It is a competition from constantly fresh waves of immigration, with lower standards of living. This newer immigration cuts its own birth-rate sharply in the second generation, but as long as there is a steady pressure of fresh immigration, the newer immigrant races have a steady advantage. It is grossly unfair to put any race against such a handicap. The older races have the desire to educate their children, to give them greater advantages in life, and it is utterly impossible to do this and raise children to meet the competition of peoples which do not have these ambitions.

Others of the old stock lament the passing of their own blood, but seem to consider it wrong in principle to try to stop the inflow of immigrants. They seem to

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

feel that it is interfering with a natural process. This might be understood in those who believe in free trade in goods, but for protectionists in goods to balk at protection in men seems a bit inconsistent.

There is nothing to indicate decadence in the colonial stock, despite all the sneers passed upon it by the immigrants. In the great Civil War it showed a courage and a strength and a will worthy of its great traditions. In the World War, the story of the Argonne with its strain and privation showed no weakening in the fiber or dilution of the blood.

Nor is its birth-rate evidence of decadence. We hear much of the birth-rates of college men and women, without taking note that the birth-rates of educated men and women are always lower than that of the mass of the population. The census gives figures of the total population, native-born, native-born with foreign-parentage, and foreign-born, by ages. These figures furnish us some basis for ascertaining how many of each class are under the age of twenty-one, which gives some indication of the proportion of children to the adult population. The foreign-born themselves do not furnish a comparable basis, for a large part of them are unmarried males. But comparing the native-born of native parentage with the native-born of foreign parentage, we find that of those of native parentage 2.5% are children under one year; for those of foreign parentage the percentage is the same; of the native parentage 12.6% are under 5 years, of the foreign parentage

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

13.5%; of the native parentage 45.2% are 19 years or under, and of the foreign parentage 47.2%.

Taking the foreign-born, the native-born of foreign parentage and the native-born of mixed parentage in one group, we find that the percentage of that group under five years was 8; under fourteen and over five years, 16.5; under twenty-four and over fifteen, 15.7. The same percentages for the native-born of native parents were 12.6 for those under five; 23 for those over five and under fifteen, and 18.5 for those over fifteen and under twenty-four.

The birth statistics indicate that the native stock is far from sterile. As stated above, the number of births per mother in the native stock is 3. In the foreign-born stock it is 4. This represents the average for all mothers, whether they are just beginning to bear children or whether they are at the end of their child-bearing period. The average for mothers born in Austria-Hungary is 4.4; in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, 3.5; in England, Scotland and Wales, 3; in Ireland, 3.4; in Germany, 4; in Italy, 4.3; in Poland, 4.7, and in Russia, 3.3.¹²

For mothers over fifty, however, the total average number born to native mothers is 7.3, to foreign mothers, 6.6, indicating either that the native mothers continue bearing longer or do not bear their children so rapidly, or perhaps that the disinclination to have large families arose with the generation later than that of the older mothers.

The differential in favor of the foreign stock is

¹² United States Birth Registration Area Report, 1923, p. 15.

THE OLD AMERICAN STOCK

enough if continued to bring the new stock into a clear predominance, but it is not such as to indicate that the native stock is decadent, that it will not bear children, that it will not more than reproduce itself. The native stock is subject to the same forces that are observable in all the more advanced countries, the diminishing birth-rate. The second generation immigrant stock is subject to the same forces. We may argue about this until we are weary, but in the meanwhile the statesmanlike thing to do is to see that the native stock is not subjected to a competition which will gradually submerge it.

CHAPTER V

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

BUT still the advocates of free admission contend that the competition must go on. They see no harm in the submergence of the old stock. In fact, they see little difference between one stock and another. They believe that all stocks soon become one in our magical alembic, and that our ideals and institutions can be carried on by one combination as well as by another.

I. THE OLD IDEAL OF THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

In short, they hold the old ideal of the melting-pot. The melting-pot ideal had two facets—the physical melting-pot and the melting-pot of beliefs, institutions and customs. In this chapter I shall deal with the first only. We believed, and many of us still believe, that America was the great caldron where all races would be commingled and out of the fusion would come a new race—stronger, more virile than any which went into the mixture. A clean, fine, strong superman would be evolved! National strength came from mixture, we were told. Nations which came from mixtures were the great races; those which tried to keep themselves pure, died out. That was before the day when we knew much of differences in race, and also before the day our immigration began to come so largely from southern and

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

eastern Europe. We boasted then that a new man was being developed, the American who would blend all the virtues and, naïvely enough, retain none of the vices of the elements which went into his make-up; and we stigmatized as narrow and petty those who expressed doubts and talked of exclusion. Thus Emerson, writing of the Know-Nothing policy of his day, said:

I hate the narrowness of the Native American party. It is the dog in the manger. It is precisely opposite to all the dictates of broad magnanimity; and therefore of course opposed to all true wisdom. . . . Man is the composite of all creatures. . . . Well, as in the old burning of the Temple at Corinth, by the melting and intermixture of silver and gold and other metals a new compound more precious than any, called Corinthian brass, was formed; so in this continent—asylum of all nations—the energy of Irish, Germans, Swedes, Poles and Cossacks, and all the European tribes—of the African and of the Polynesian will construct a new race, a new religion, a new State, a new literature, which will be as vigorous as the new Europe which came out of the smelting pot of the Dark Ages, or that which earlier emerged from the Pelagic and Etruscan barbarism. *La Nature aime les croisements.*¹

Years later Joseph H. Choate expressed much the same beliefs. He wrote to an English friend in 1899:

Now then, what is the result? Why, a new man has been created. . . . He is not an Englishman, nor a Scotchman, nor an Irishman nor an imitation of any of these nations of Europe; but he combines them all and in the composition is a new and perfect blend.²

¹ Quoted in Stuart P. Sherman's *Americans*, p. 104.

² E. S. Martin, *The Life of Joseph H. Choate*, Vol. II, p. 96.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

It may be noted that Mr. Choate did not hold this belief in 1915. This was the old idyllic American belief of the golden nineties before disillusion had come upon us. In 1915 Mr. Choate wrote to an English friend explaining our opinion on the war: "I do not wish to use any offensive words, but we have many millions of men of foreign descent, one half of them on one side and one half on the other."³

Of course, the classic expression of the melting-pot ideal, both as to the melting-pot of races and that of institutions and customs, was given us by Zangwill. Jew though he was, he had none of the normal Jewish resentment of racial crossing. In *The Melting Pot*, David, the hero, an idealistic young Jew in love with Vera, an American girl, declares time and again that "these are the fires of God you've come to—these are the fires of God. . . . Germans and Frenchmen, Irishmen and Englishmen, Jews and Russians—into the crucible with you all; God is making the American."

Mendel asks: "I should have thought the American was made already—eighty millions of him."

David: "Eighty millions! Over a continent! Why, that cockle shell of a Britain has fifty millions. No, uncle, the real American has not yet arrived. He is only in the crucible, I tell you—he will be the fusion of all races, perhaps the coming superman."

Again David tells Vera, rapturously: "There she lies, the great Melting Pot—listen. Can't you hear the roaring and the bubbling? There gapes the mouth

³ *Ibid.*, p. 378.

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

—the harbor where a thousand mammoth feeders come from the ends of the world to pour in their human freight. Ah, what a stirring and a seething, Celt and Latin, Slav and Teuton, Greek and Syrian—black and yellow——”

Vera, softly, nestling to him,

“Jew and Gentile.”

David: “Yes. East and West and North and South, the palm and the pine, the pole and the equator, the crescent and the cross—how the great alchemist melts and fuses them with purging flame.”⁴

It is but fifteen years since this burning faith was the faith of the vast majority. The play touched the most idealistic and deepest chords of our national sentiment.

Yet up till then, the actual mixture had gone little farther than intermarriage between the races of north Europe. The intermarriage between Englishman and Roumanian, Norwegian and Serb, Scotchman and Italian, was almost entirely one of fancy and not of fact. The actual prospect of mixture of radically different types has cooled much of this rhapsodic faith. Scientists too have been busy these fifteen years with stern studies of the effect of interbreeding and, while their studies have not yet brought positive conclusions, they have at least brought much doubt.

Yet the belief in the making of a new race is far from dead. Mr. Albert A. Hopkins, associate editor of the *Scientific American*, states that the “whole basis of our present immigration policy, as well as of

⁴Zangwill, *The Melting Pot*, p. 15.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

all policies recently proposed, is discrimination between prospective immigrants on the ground of race." He asks whether there is any scientific justification for such discrimination. He argues that there is not. First, he lays down the proposition that "there is no such thing as a pure-bred race: The 'pure Nordic' idea is a myth. The second is that not one scrap of real evidence exists to prove that any one race is potentially abler, or more honest or more intelligent than any other race. . . . The third is that racial mixture—even to what we would shrink from as extremes—seems much more likely to be beneficial to civilization than the reverse."⁵

To establish these points he argues that,

The origins of races, the roots of our present world politics go back into this dim and distant prehistoric period when the great drama of the peopling of the earth was just beginning to unfold. . . . Races have originated by the slow alteration, under force of climate and other circumstances, of successive migration waves out of Asia.

These waves encountered opposition, wars ensued, and there was a constant boiling of the pot both in Asia whence they came and in Europe into which they came. The result is that the white race is already as blended as any other. In our ancestry, as in that of the American Indian, we can trace the elements of early negroid races, of the Australian savage, of the Alpines who helped to settle America, of Mongols and of half a dozen others. Among the ancestors of every American business man one could find, it is safe to say, every important racial element of prehistoric times; every type of human animal in the world, from the

⁵ *Scientific American*, February, 1925, p. 77.

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

Chinese philosopher to the savage chieftain of a caveman tribe.

This is the argument for our first conclusion, the conclusion that there is no such thing as a pure-bred race—not even a pure-bred individual—in the modern world. All of our so-called races are already blends. Why should we be afraid of further blending?

From this argument, too, it is easy to see that no great case can be made for any superiority of certain races over other races. The great peoples of the past have not been of pure race. All of them have been like us, the products of slow but effective mixture.

To talk of menaces in racial mixture is equally absurd. If racial mixture could have ruined mankind, that ruin would have been completed many millenniums before any scribe set down one word of history. Indeed, a degree of racial mixture seems actually to be stimulating to human intelligence and human enterprise.

It is worthwhile to see, as a first preliminary to the scientific study of the problem, that racial differences are much less sharp and rigid than we have been accustomed to imagine. The most diverse of races are but our cousins who left the ancestral Asian roof-tree a little earlier or a little differently than we did ourselves.⁶

Professor Griffith Taylor, in a lecture before the Royal Colonial Institute at Sydney, Australia, likewise insisted that no such thing as a pure race exists anywhere except perhaps in the unpenetrated regions of Central Asia. "All the known races are mixed races including the pure Nordic ones. A homogeneous nation therefore is only a myth. According to modern scientists what was at one time labelled as

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

racial characteristics is now known to be only racial differences."

"I wish," said Professor Taylor, "that our politicians would realize this. It is germane to many of our most important problems to-day. Foolishly people imagine that racial mixture is necessarily bad, forgetting that even in Britain, the most virile nation on earth, there is more than one racial stock."⁷

Professor Franz Boas also argues that if we are trying to select Nordics, we are falling into a simple error for there are Nordics among the South Europeans and Mediterraneans among the North European countries.⁸ This assumes that we are trying to select Nordics. I will try to show that that is not the object. But clearly, there are more Nordics among the English or the Norwegians than among the South Italians. The chance of getting 700 Nordics among 1,000 Englishmen is clearly greater than that of getting them among 1,000 South Italians.

It is evident that the critics do not agree. In the first place, if there is no Nordic race, if all races are mixed and we all came from a common stock, then why all the ridicule poured on the devotees of the Nordic race? Why is there such bitter insistence that no race is superior to another? If we are all the same race, that is, if no ascertainable differences can be agreed upon, then there is no question of racial superiority or inferiority. One man claims there are no Nordics; another that there are Nordics in all na-

⁷ *New York Times*, June 20, 1926.

⁸ *Forum*, October, 1925.

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

tions. He argues, then, that nations and not races are mixed.

Of course, there are differences in racial types. However true it may be that we all had the same origin and have all been mixed in the great crucible of the ages, the fact remains that it has been the crucible of the ages. No one denies that in the beginning there was probably little variation between the ancestors of the present whites and blacks. But there is such a difference discernible now. Long selection has differentiated types. There is an English type. There is a Norwegian type. While there is no doubt that Englishmen and Slovaks may trace back to the same roots, so may the president of Harvard and the village moron. That does not mean that we need be snobbish in our judgment of the village moron, but it certainly does not mean that in the course of some hundreds or thousands of years distinct variations of brain structure and physical characteristics may not have occurred. If those who deny differences in racial types mean that at the end of some thousands of years of intermarriage of races on this continent the types may be so mixed that no one can tell whether he came from an English or a Slovak root, no one would say nay. But that does not tell us what will be happening in the course of the thousands of years nor does it tell us whether the result will be a type superior or inferior to the present type nor, much less, superior or inferior to what the present type might become if it did not mix with the descendants of the Greeks and the Slovaks.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

2. NO QUESTION OF RACIAL SUPERIORITY

It is assumed also that the question is one of race inferiority and superiority. A few ardent advocates may have given some basis for this assumption. But the demand for immigration restriction is based on no such claim. It is based on racial difference. It cannot be repeated too often that I make no claim of racial superiority of North European over South European. I do not claim that the North European is braver in war, stronger physically, keener mentally, more moral or more lovable than the South European. I make this claim no more than I claim that the white man is superior to the yellow man or the black. I make only one claim of superiority in the old colonial stock over the later comers. I do believe that the colonial stock has a superior political aptitude, or at least an ingrained political tradition and training superior to any of the immigrants from southeastern Europe or indeed from northwestern Europe, save only those coming from Great Britain. I will consider this point more fully later on. Aside from political tradition or habit, the argument in this book makes no claim of superiority in the white man over the black or yellow man, or in the Northwestern European over the Southeastern European, or in the old-stock American over the new-stock. The essential point is not superiority or inferiority, but difference—a profound difference between races—more deep and profound, it is true, of course, in a comparison between the black and yellow man and

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

the white man than between the old-stock American and the Greek, Armenian or the South Italian, but a deep and profound difference all the same.

The differences are so pronounced that it is impossible to say that mixture would result advantageously. That is all that it is necessary to say. It is not necessary to prove that mixture is undesirable. The burden of proof is on the other side. It is for the advocates of mixture to prove that the unprecedented mixture of races which would result in our country from a fusion of all the races that they would bring to us would result in a race superior to that we have now.

3. DOUBTS AS TO THE RACIAL MELTING-POT

The question of the racial melting-pot is manifestly too big a one for a layman to handle. The dispute is too bitter among scientists for an amateur to be confident of his opinion. We can, however, register our doubts. We can at least say that the assurance that a fine breed will emerge from the mixing in America of all the races that free immigration would bring is not great. In the first place, there is no nation in the world which offers any comparison. Time and again we are referred to England as an example of the benefits of the melting-pot. Yet England is a mixture, not of a score of races, but of two at most. Aside from the prehistoric and negligible Neanderthal man and the Cro-Magnon, her stock is composed of the old Iberian or Mediterranean stock which preceded the Nordic invasions, the Angles,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Saxons and Danes who conquered them, and the Normans who conquered Saxon England. There have been small infiltrations of Flemish and French and Jews, but the great elements of her population are the Mediterranean Britons, the old English and the Normans. There is great dispute as to the extent to which the Britons survived the Saxon conquest. The latest authorities discount the old stories of the wholesale wiping out of the Mediterranean stock, and hold that a very considerable element survived. But the later racial elements were remarkably homogeneous. The Angles, Saxons and Jutes all came from the same general section of Denmark and Germany. The Danes and the Normans, although the latter had a French admixture, were closely allied to each other and to the old English stock. There has been nothing in England's experience to give us any light on our own case, where not three or four racial stocks are involved, but a score. We have English, Scotch, Welsh and Irish, Germans, Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, Dutch, Czechs, Yugoslavs, Italians, Greeks, Bulgarians, Roumanians, Russians of many different kinds, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Poles, Jews, French, Spaniards, Finns, Armenians and Mexicans. There is no experience in the history of the world that tells us that a mixture of such diverse and positive stocks will have a happy result.

The question is so completely technical, however, that I do not think it wise to make any extended observations of my own. Suffice it to say that following the laws of Mendelian inheritance, the qualities

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

of mother and father do not always blend or fuse in the offspring. Mendel proved that if white mice are crossed with black the offspring will be three black to one white. Then if each of these groups is crossed with its own color—that is, black with black and white with white—the offspring will breed white in one-fourth, which will henceforth always breed white, one-fourth will be black and will always breed black thereafter, and half will breed three-fourths black and one-fourth white. The result is that from at least half of the crossing of diverse types come pure blacks and pure whites; the other half will breed blacks and whites in a fixed proportion.

But the problem goes deeper. According to the Mendelian and post-Mendelian studies, many characteristics have each its own inheritance. Height, weight, color of eyes, size of bones, etc., each follows separately the Mendelian laws. Therefore, when diverse types are crossed, the offspring may have one characteristic of one parent and another characteristic of another parent. Now when a race has by long evolution reached what, to us, is an advanced stage of development, there has probably been evolved a somewhat harmonious combination of characteristics. But when one highly evolved type is mated with another type, whether high or low, there is no way of knowing that the combination will be happy.

But enough of my layman's summary of scientific doubts! Let Professor Samuel J. Holmes, Professor of Biology at Leland Stanford, speak for me. In his *Studies in Evolution* he says:

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The student of human heredity may not be in a position to prove that in general the crossing of races, even very distinct races, is to be condemned per se. Aside from the alleged inferior physique of the mulatto, there is little to indicate that human hybrids are very conspicuously inferior because of their hybrid origin. They may be inferior to the superior race. They are probably superior, at least mentally, to the inferior race. The crossing of races on different mental levels, is therefore inadvisable. But before advocating or encouraging the mixture of different but equivalent races we should have fuller knowledge than we now possess of just what the results will be. The inheritance of a superior race is a very precious possession to be conserved at all costs. *The argument from ignorance should not be used to defend race crossing because we cannot prove that it is bad; it should be used rather to counsel caution because we do not know that it is not bad.* In the light of our ignorance about race crossing, the wisest course is to go slow and play safe. Our ignorance is no justification for taking a leap in the dark.

This needs especially to be emphasized in the light of other considerations drawn from our knowledge of Mendelian segregation. Formerly inheritance was considered to be typically blending, and the subsequent generations of a racial cross were thought to be very much like the first. This is now known to be far from correct. Characters that appear to blend in the first generation of a cross segregate out in various combinations and in the second and subsequent generations, and we get in wide crosses a motley array of the most diverse forms. This is because the parent types differ in a considerable number of hereditary factors. The more different factors there are, the larger the number of different combinations that can be made from them. And however harmonious the blend made in the first cross, the second generation is apt to produce many unfortunate combinations of traits.

In the structures that go to make up the human head and

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

face there are many characters that segregate out in various ways in the second generation of a racial cross. In each race there is a fairly harmonious adjustment of shape of skull, relative size of facial bones, size and shape of jaw, size of teeth, etc. In a cross of different races owing to the varying dimensions of these several characteristics and their segregation in different combinations we may observe narrow jaws with broad head, small jaws with large teeth, and various other jumbles of anatomical characteristics, which certainly detract from comeliness if not effectiveness of physical organization. Kingsley, Talbott, and other writers on dental anomalies attribute a large part of our dental maladjustment to the intermarriage of different racial stocks. Large teeth set in small jaws are a fertile source of trouble, and there are other maladjustments of an analogous kind.

.

By way of summarizing our discussion of race mixture we may present the following tentative conclusions:

The crossing of distinct races is not demonstrably followed except possibly in the case of the mulatto, by a marked decrease in vitality of the hybrids.

There seems to be no good evidence, on the other hand, except in the height of certain half-breeds, that there is any enhancement of vigor in human hybrids such as occurs not uncommonly in crosses among animals and plants.

There is no clearly demonstrated loss of fertility, despite many assertions to the contrary, in crosses of the most divergent races of mankind.

The mentality of crosses between different races of different degrees of mental development seems to be somewhere between the mental levels of the parental races.

Even where two distinct races are on the same mental level, extensive crossing should not be encouraged until more is known concerning just how it is likely to work out. Not only

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

is our knowledge of the blending in the first generation insufficient, but we have little accurate information on the more important subject of the varied products of subsequent generations. . . . This suspicion is more or less confirmed by a casual inspection of the motley products of the so-called race fusion. There may, however, be advantages in the crossing of some races; but the fact should be established before crossing becomes so extensive as to threaten the persistence of either pure race. Concerning race mixture in general it is well to adhere to the old maxim: Be sure you are right before going ahead.⁹

President Eliot, while he was a life-long advocate of free immigration, years ago gave a layman's warning along the lines of that of Professor Holmes:

The different races [he said], of mankind have been produced by the exposure to different conditions of life through long ages, of groups that may have presented at the start marked diversities. They now possess different powers, desires, and capacities, and immunities. Their bodies are unlike in many respects, some trivial, others important. Their minds work differently and their dispositions are unlike. Experience teaches that intermarriage between two races which present marked diversities ordinarily results in offspring inferior to each parent. Thus, no satisfactory blend of a European race with a far-eastern race has as yet appeared. The Eurasians are, as a rule, feebler than either of the stocks which mix; and these experiments have been tried on a considerable scale, and with several races, both European and Asiatic. A prepotent race like the Hebrew can apparently recover from an occasional admixture of other races; but on the whole, the survival of the Jewish race in extraordinary vigor is a striking lesson on the value of racial purity. Intermarriage between

⁹ S. J. Holmes, *Studies in Evolution and Eugenics*, pp. 222-6 Harcourt, Brace & Co.

THE MELTING-POT OF RACES

racess which strongly resemble each other and have been neighbors for centuries like the Teutonic and Scandinavian peoples of Northern Europe, is comparatively safe, and in regard to marriage between individuals of different races, there are many special cases, and many exceptions to the rule, but in general, the ideal of a people made up from many different races and living under free institutions should be the perpetuation of racial diversity, and not the bringing about of a racial blend.¹⁰

Yet if great masses of differing alien groups are allowed to enter our country, there is no question that there will be many intermarriages between different groups. It would seem that President Eliot's argument was a bit academic. He did not believe in racial crosses, but he was vigorous in his advocacy of free immigration. But if free immigration is allowed, no argument can prevent free mating.

It is enough to say, then, that the desirability of the racial melting-pot has not been proved. The central theme of *Abie's Irish Rose* seems, strangely enough, to appeal to some instinct in the American people, in the newer immigrants particularly I think, an instinct quite incompatible with racial pride in one's own race, but it is certainly not an instinct which as yet has any foundation in scientific investigation. In the first place, many characteristics do not fuse or blend—they segregate out. Some offspring inherit a trait from one parent; some inherit its opposite from the other parent. In the second place, it is impos-

¹⁰Quoted in *New York Times Magazine Section*, Review by John Corbin of *Patriotism of the American Jew* by Samuel Walker McCall, November 25 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

sible to say that the traits from the two parents will combine harmoniously in the offspring. There is much to cause us to believe that mixture of diverse races may entail jarring misfits, and that it may delay or even stop the development of desirable types. There is nothing to cause us to believe that the superman comes from the mixture of distinct types. It may rather result in such a population as that of Sicily and South Italy where Italians, Greeks, Saracens, negroes, Normans, Spaniards and Phœnicians have mixed with results so conglomerate and so unhappy that they have cursed those regions and their peoples to this day.

CHAPTER VI

THE MELTING-POT OF INSTITUTIONS AND CUSTOMS. WHAT IS A NATION?

I. THE OLD IDEAL OF THE MELTING-POT OF INSTITUTIONS

WHAT then of the melting-pot of institutions and customs? What of the effect of the mingling of many races on our politics, our law, our traditions? Here the melting-pot theory is subject to two vitally different conceptions. The average American of yesterday was a firm believer in the racial melting-pot. He might not want his own children to marry South Europeans—in fact, it never entered his head that they would. As to his remote descendants, he probably felt that it was their look-out whom they married. He certainly believed that there was magic in everybody else intermarrying. But he had no conception that the institutions of the country, its laws, its political habits and traditions, were to be modified by the melting-pot. If he did not believe that they were fixed, he certainly did not believe that they were subject to the influence of the immigrant. The immigrant was to be Americanized. He was to learn our language, to revere our Constitution, to cherish the deeds of our forefathers. The immigrant was in the melting-pot but we were not. The average American had no idea that he was to be changed, or

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

American institutions modified by the immigrant. Many Americans to-day, and most of the immigrants, believe that this attitude is not only unspeakably arrogant, but fated to disappointment. It is not their idea of the melting-pot of institutions at all. It was not Zangwill's idea. They ask what right we have, because we came first, to impose our standards and customs on the immigrant. They roundly assert that it cannot be done. Their ideal of the melting-pot, which I shall consider later after we have seen what success the traditional American ideal has had, is that as we are all cast into the melting-pot of racial mixture, as we shall all be made over physically by intermarriage with each other, so inevitably our customs, our habits, our traditions and our political institutions are all in the melting-pot together and from it will emerge a new America. But I do no more than mention this Zangwill ideal here to make clear that it is not the ideal whose nature and success we shall first consider. The standard ideal was that somehow we, the native blood, were outside the melting-pot while the immigrants were in it. The foreign dross of the immigrants was to be burned off by our melting-pot and they were to emerge Americans. It was common to say, if we were very pessimistic, that while the immigrants themselves might not become thoroughly Americanized, their children were no different from the rest of us. We proudly boasted that after a few short years the South Italian or the Serb wore American clothes, talked American slang, sang "The Star Spangled Banner," and, lo! he was

WHAT IS A NATION?

an American, as good as any that came over on the *Mayflower*, and he who denied it was an insufferable snob. One writer told how the school children, "Proud of being Americans, they sing 'My Country, 'tis of Thee,' they salute the flag, their flag." I recall how a former Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New York instanced as a proof of the rapidity with which the immigrant, or rather the children of the immigrant, became Americanized, the story of a little Italian boy whose father started to punish him and who fiercely resisted. When brought up before the juvenile judge, he was asked why he had been so determined in his resistance. He answered, "Well, Judge, honest now, do you think an American ought to let himself be licked by a foreigner?" The audience of business men who heard this tragic story broke into roars of laughter. Perhaps some of them realized the poignant tragedy of the position of the alien father, and let us hope that even some who laughed realized that Americanism was something other than an assertive and an impudent spirit.

Another writer spoke of "how after a year or two in the public schools the children of foreign birth or descent come trooping down the steps of the school house with little flags in their right hands and singing, 'My Country, 'tis of Thee.'" She spoke of the "ability of the United States to absorb and Americanize foreign elements as one of the most wonderful achievements of the nation and the most hopeful signs of its stability."

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

One writer admits that the adult Italian is slow to learn our language, but that "children born in this country of Italian parents can scarcely be distinguished by their speech or their habits from the children of native Americans." Another warns that, "A man or woman, born in Europe cannot ever be completely transformed into just the American the native born is found to be. But it is unnecessary to hasten the process. Natural evolution will do the work and the transformation will be complete in the second generation."

Professor Ripley of Harvard well expressed the ideal of the America of yesterday in his Huxley Memorial Lecture of 1908. "You have your white man's burden in India," he declared to his audience, "we have ours to bear with the American negro and the Filipinos. But an even greater responsibility with us, and with your Canadian fellow citizens, is that of the 'Anglo-Saxon's burden,'—and to so nourish, uplift, and inspire all these immigrant peoples of Europe that in due course of time, even if the physical stock be inundated by the engulfing flood, the torch of Anglo-Saxon civilization and ideals, borne by our fathers from England to America, shall yet burn as bright and clear in the New World as your fires have continued to illuminate the Old."

The great mass of Americans has followed this ideal of the Melting-Pot. It has been the dominant ideal of perhaps three generations and it is potent even to-day. Indeed, most Americans, although they may have doubts of the physical blending of races,

WHAT IS A NATION?

have no doubts whatever of the possibilities of assimilation, psychologically and politically.

It is the custom to stigmatize as bigoted and snobbish any person who looks with restless discontent at the outgrowth of foreign names of a southeastern or southern European cast. The *New York Times*, for example, delights in ridiculing the Know-Nothingism of those who it declares believe in a Nordic America. Like many other believers in the efficiency of the Melting-Pot, it delights in listing names of men and women of the newer immigrant races who are contributing or have contributed to our science, art, government and athletic achievement. "After the public schools," it said in an editorial of October 11, 1925, "it is in the field of sports that we must look for the principal molding force of a sense of kind, as the sociologists call it. The baseball diamond, which is the nation's great playground, has long reflected this assimilative process. The rosters of the past show names like Reulbach, Schulte, Wagner, Abbaticchio, Luderus, Niehoff. Contemporary lists would be incomplete without Fournier, Gonzales, Toporcer, Severeid, Liebold, Manush, Wambsganss, Genewich, Dauss, Ehmke, Luque. Every circuit smash delivered by a descendant of the Alpines or the Mediterraneans is a blow at K.K.K-ism. Religious and racial intolerance is bound to yield before the impact of a single year's champions in the squared ring—Dempsey, Greb, Walker, Leonard and Goldstein in that high company adorned by other names, Pancho

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Villa, Renault, Berlenbach, Genaro, Vicentini, Spalla, Weinert.

"The football lists are a disaster for the bigots of racialism. When Lafayette played Pittsburgh a week ago yesterday Grube, Duffy, Ford, and Kirleski lined up against Salata, Steele, Wissinger and Gustafson. A casual eyestroll down this sporting page for that same Saturday showed what might well make the Wizards and the Kleagles turn pale and shudder, provided they were not too busy rooting from the sidelines: Oberlander, Polanski, Dagrossa, Jermano, Berkowitz, Saltonstall, Hanf, Aulich, Kaplan, Kirchmeyer, Brady, Flaherty, Butterworth, Schmitetitsch, Maniere, Dougherty, Baziliewitch, Kilgour, Bridges, Janowsky, Mittenweiler, Prendergast, Coady, Novotny, Kasseli and Hobson.

"It is a cause for congratulation that this mingling of strains and stocks and creeds should have made such progress on the playing field, where precisely fellowship, self-control and manhood are the ideals striven for. A people that plays so well together will not spend much time in hate. Was it conceivably by a brief glance down the football page that President Coolidge was spurred to speak out so courageously against the sectionalists and the fanatic?"

The argument from the athletic field is also made by the *Chicago Tribune*. In an editorial of October 31, 1925, it said:

Oosterbaan, Friedman, Molenda—of Michigan, Kreuz and Sieracki of Penn, Pokrass of Chicago, Gustafson and Schumaker

WHAT IS A NATION?

of Northwestern, Kutsch of Iowa, Marek, Hierongmous, Karow and Uridil of Ohio State; Bernoske of Indiana.

For two months in the fall these names and names like them are better known than Mr. Hoover's or Mr. Kellogg's. They are testimony to the melting pot, and of that super melting pot, college athletics. Who thinks or who cares whether their fathers or grandfathers came from Holland or Germany, Poland or Czecho-Slovakia? They battle across the white lines of the gridiron the way they fought over the shell holes of the Argonne and that's American enough for us. . . .

What the automobile is doing geographically the public schools and colleges are doing socially, stirring the races into one race. School and college athletics are the great mixing machines. The ability to make a touchdown does not belong to a Slav, or an Italian, or an Irishman. It belongs to an American.

Recently the *New York Times* quoted editorially from the letters from America of J. L. Garvin. It notes with satisfaction that Mr. Garvin says we need "not worry that the Irish make athletic records or be anxious lest we have too large an infusion of the blood more or less common to Dante, Michael Angelo, and Cavour, or despair if the American race of the future shows distinct traces of the blood that produced Tolstoi, or of that which brought forth Luther, Goethe and Bismarck."¹

Here we see the favorite device of arguing from shining examples rather than from the mass.

The theory of the racial melting-pot is, in some of these quotations, mixed up with the theory of the melting-pot of institutions. But most of them deal

¹ *New York Times*, July 19, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

rather with the contribution that each representative can make to our progress or achievement than with the blending of physical types. Each race will make its own peculiar contribution to us and from the total of gifts and performances showered upon us will come a far richer result than if we limited ourselves to the old single colonial stock, or even the mixture which we now have.

The question we have to answer, however difficult the answer may be, is simple to state. We make no point that the South European, any more than the Irishman or the German or Swede, is less moral in conduct, less humanly likable than the early American stock. The Greek, the Slav, the Italian, are frugal, hard-working, likable. But the essence of the matter is that they are different—different in language, different in psychology, different in customs. They are different from the old stock, and the various groups of newer immigrants differ from each other. It may well be that any one of these newer racial groups, although it may be one which has never shown political capacity in its own country, could produce a great nation under the favorable auspices of the Twentieth Century on this continent. But can they produce a great nation when they are all mixed in together, and, what is nearer our question, can we maintain the great nation which we have built up—a nation with a tradition, a law, a system of politics, the beginnings of a literature, all the expression of a people closely allied in race and through a long and intimate relationship, when, as may be the case in a

WHAT IS A NATION?

hundred years, but one-tenth of that nation belongs to the racial group which those institutions express, and nine-tenths in about equal proportions belong to a dozen different racial groups with a dozen different political traditions?

We cannot consider this question without giving our definition of a nation. The definition of a nation is as tattered a subject as the definition of sovereignty.

2. WHAT MAKES A NATION?

Some declare that a nation is only a people living in a definite territory, subject to the same government. It is not necessary that they be of the same race. It is not necessary that they have the same traditions. A nation is a people in a definite territory, subject to the same government, but it is more than that. A common government and a common territory are necessary for a nation but they are more often the result of nationality than the cause of it. A nation may extend its power over an adjoining province, but the province becomes a weakness to the nation, a thorn in its side, and a source of trouble in time of crisis unless it acquires the characteristics of the nation to which it is joined; unless, indeed, it becomes in fact and spirit a part of that nation. In the past, Austria-Hungary has been cited as a nation which was not formed on the basis of unity of race. Ireland has been cited as an example of a different people which was still a part of the nation of the United Kingdom. But Austria-Hungary was a nation in spite of the diversity of its population and not

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

because of it. To the extent that Hungary and the portions of the old empire which have become parts of Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia were not spiritual parts of Austria-Hungary, they weakened instead of aided her nationality. The government and the territory which are essential to the formation of a nation are then but the external signs of nationality. In its internal manifestations there must first begin a spiritual unity.

A common language is the first and fundamental essential. Even the most stubborn protestant against uniformity and standardization should be willing to concede the necessity of a common language. If he is willing to grant the demands of our employers of labor, he ought surely to be willing to admit the veraciousness of the experience of industry, which is that for its simplest requirement, safety, a common language is an essential.

But a common speech is the necessary basis also of the subtler and deeper development of a people. The political meeting, so dramatic and real an influence in the days of our growth, the newspaper article, the daily intercourse of friendship and business—all are impossible without a common language.

A nation must also have a common law—a law applicable to every one within its jurisdiction, applying to all alike in similar situations. It is true that in the United States there is no common law applicable to the whole United States. We have a common law applicable only to each state. But the courts of each state are not in all cases the final judges of that ap-

WHAT IS A NATION?

plication of that law. Under the Fourteenth Amendment, no state can pass any law which denies any person subject to its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, or take life, liberty or property without due process of law. No state can impair the obligation of a contract, nor deny citizens of other states equal privileges and immunities with citizens of its own state. It can pass no law which regulates or restricts commerce between the states. In a very real sense, then, there is a unity of law in the United States—a unity without which there could be no nation. Indeed, Justice Holmes has remarked, "I do not think the United States would come to an end if we lost our power to declare an Act of Congress void. I do think the Union would be imperiled if we could not make that declaration as to the laws of the several States." ²

England and France likewise found that until they had a unified administration of law, they were not nations. Whatever one may think of the ruthless government of William the Conqueror, one is forced to admit that he had a strong and dominating sense of national efficiency. One of his first acts as King of England was to centralize justice, to introduce traveling justiciars who went from county to county administering the king's justice and allowing appeals from the manorial courts to the King's Bench. He knew that as long as the decision of the Court of a Baron could be final, the power of the part prevailed over the power of the whole. The heptarchy of

² Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Collected Legal Papers*, p. 296.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

because of it. To the extent that Hungary and the portions of the old empire which have become parts of Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia were not spiritual parts of Austria-Hungary, they weakened instead of aided her nationality. The government and the territory which are essential to the formation of a nation are then but the external signs of nationality. In its internal manifestations there must first begin a spiritual unity.

A common language is the first and fundamental essential. Even the most stubborn protestant against uniformity and standardization should be willing to concede the necessity of a common language. If he is willing to grant the demands of our employers of labor, he ought surely to be willing to admit the veraciousness of the experience of industry, which is that for its simplest requirement, safety, a common language is an essential.

But a common speech is the necessary basis also of the subtler and deeper development of a people. The political meeting, so dramatic and real an influence in the days of our growth, the newspaper article, the daily intercourse of friendship and business—all are impossible without a common language.

A nation must also have a common law—a law applicable to every one within its jurisdiction, applying to all alike in similar situations. It is true that in the United States there is no common law applicable to the whole United States. We have a common law applicable only to each state. But the courts of each state are not in all cases the final judges of that ap-

WHAT IS A NATION?

plication of that law. Under the Fourteenth Amendment, no state can pass any law which denies any person subject to its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, or take life, liberty or property without due process of law. No state can impair the obligation of a contract, nor deny citizens of other states equal privileges and immunities with citizens of its own state. It can pass no law which regulates or restricts commerce between the states. In a very real sense, then, there is a unity of law in the United States—a unity without which there could be no nation. Indeed, Justice Holmes has remarked, "I do not think the United States would come to an end if we lost our power to declare an Act of Congress void. I do think the Union would be imperiled if we could not make that declaration as to the laws of the several States."²

England and France likewise found that until they had a unified administration of law, they were not nations. Whatever one may think of the ruthless government of William the Conqueror, one is forced to admit that he had a strong and dominating sense of national efficiency. One of his first acts as King of England was to centralize justice, to introduce traveling justiciars who went from county to county administering the king's justice and allowing appeals from the manorial courts to the King's Bench. He knew that as long as the decision of the Court of a Baron could be final, the power of the part prevailed over the power of the whole. The heptarchy of

² Oliver Wendell Holmes, *Collected Legal Papers*, p. 296.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Anglo-Saxon days gave way and the centralization of law was undoubtedly one of the major forces in the transformation.

So in France, the nation did not become dominant until the law of the old provinces was subordinated to the law of France. As long as the courts of Toulouse and Burgundy and Poitou were final arbiters of the law of their jurisdictions, there was no real France.

Not only must the law be national but it must be single. A single, national law does not arise until there is a custom, a common practice and opinion of the community on which it can rest. Where a number of different peoples come together in one community, one of three things happens: There may be no common opinion, no common standard on many matters, and so large fields of conduct must be left untouched by law until common standards, a common opinion, are formed or the stronger race imposes its own standards on the weaker, or lastly there is one law for the stronger and one for the weaker. In England, after the Norman Conquest, there was one law for the Normans and one for the English. For centuries the country had the custom of Englishry, by which a county was compelled to punish the slayer of a Norman, but if the victim were an Englishman and the county could so prove, no fine was levied. In France, the Franks and Burgundians administered their own tribal laws, while the Gallic population remained subject to the old Roman law. Law was, therefore, at first tribal. A man was sub-

WHAT IS A NATION?

ject to the law of his own tribe or race. Later, law became territorial—all persons in a county or province became subject to the same law. Finally, law became national. In France this did not come about until the days of the Revolution.

Likewise a nation requires common political institutions. A nation cannot have one political assembly for one race and another for another race. Its representatives must meet together and act together in one Parliament. Here again, Austria-Hungary may be presented to us as an example which refutes this statement. But again we can only say that the clumsy nation which was Austria-Hungary, which did exist with two parliaments, showed its weakness time and again and broke under the strain of the war. Her case proves rather than refutes my statement. The two nations became two in fact as they had long been in spirit.

So also, the separate parliaments of the British dominions do not make an exception to this principle. Canada, Australia, and South Africa have separate parliaments, but in essence they are separate nations. Legally, or perhaps we may say constitutionally, the British Empire is one state, but for all practical purposes Great Britain and North Ireland make one nation and each of the dominions another nation.

3. A NATION COMES FROM THE PAST

A nation is knit closer by common economic interests. The spirit of nationality in the United States

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

was aided, or perhaps made possible, by the steamboat and the railroad ministering to trade and travel. But, after all, economic unity arises from spiritual unity, or rather spreads it farther. Economic interests do not make the group. They may aid the group to expand. But they often run athwart national boundaries. There is a stronger force, one which aids the economic interests within the nation and which often defeats or ignores the economic interests between various nations. Back of all is like-mindedness, a common psychology, a veritable consciousness among the people of kinship with each other. This sense of oneness runs all through the dialect poems of James Whitcomb Riley. His very titles, "On the Banks of Deer Crick," "The Old Swimmin' Hole" and "Little Orphant Annie" recall to thousands in the Middle West a happy and coherent past. The same sense of like-mindedness was vividly touched in millions of the old Americans by the scene in the Vermont farmhouse when Colonel Coolidge swore in his son as President. Like-mindedness is the sense that people are like us, that we understand them and that, as Riley said, they are "Home-folks."

"Home-folks—they're jis the same as kin
All brung up, same as we have bin."

A group of people does not become a nation until it is animated by common standards of life and thought. I do not mean that a nation may not have a vivid clash of opinion, a healthy action and reac-

WHAT IS A NATION?

tion. Every healthy community must have them. No one wants a dull monotony of belief and action. A family gets its very life from the differences in temperament among its members. So a nation will stagnate unless it has a play and variety and interchange of thought. But both will utterly split up and fall apart unless they are maintained by a common tradition and a common loyalty. A nation must have a common language but that, after all, is only its alphabet for the expression of its common thought. It must have a law which is the expression of its needs and its psychology, and a politics which is the outgrowth of its personality. But all these depend on and grow out of like-mindedness and, above all, common backgrounds and traditions to which appeal may confidently be made. Until a nation has these, it is only a geographical expression. When it loses them, it becomes again a geographical expression.

Duguit, the Dean of Law at Bordeaux, in searching for the essence of nationality, rejects a common government, common law, language and religion as the tests. They are "necessary limits" but after all secondary elements. "The essential element of national unity," he says, "it is necessary to seek in the community of traditions, of needs, of aspirations. Humanity, it has been said, is formed more of the dead than of the living; the nation also is formed more of the dead than of the living. The memory of battles undergone, of triumphs gained and especially of defeats sustained in common, has contrib-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

uted powerfully to create and make more definite the national sense of solidarity.”²

Lincoln spoke in his “Second Inaugural” of the “mystic chords of memory stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land” which he prophesied would “yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.” It was these mystic chords which, in the crucial days of 1917, sounded forth sweet and true and strong above all the raucous alien clamor. Hermann Hagedorn wrote then of the “ghosts from the fields of Valley Forge” and “the hills of Gettysburg,” of the voices calling to us “out of the sacred ground” not to let their sacrifice be in vain. In 1916 I talked with an Indiana interurban motorman who had been aroused by the German submarine attacks. He said that his friends in the corner drug store asked him when he told them that the time had come to “stop such business”—“Well, would you go?” We should not forget that in 1916 there were many who felt that this question was enough to answer all war talk. But the man’s answer was, “My father left my mother and three children to go to the Civil War. If I went now, I would leave my wife and two children behind. But if I did not come back, somehow they would be taken care of. Yes, by God, I would go. What the hell are ancestors for, if not to live up to?” No better statement of the beautiful force of national tradition could be

² Duguit, *Traité de droit constitutionnel*, Vol. II, p. 7.

WHAT IS A NATION?

made. Thus, always in a crisis, the past decides the present; old traditions, the love of the homeland, decide for us in moments of doubt. It was the force of a mighty national tradition, nurtured through centuries, that brought the sons of England from the Australian bush, from the forests of western Canada, from the hinterland of South Africa, moving always to the coast—first in a tiny stream, swelling to a mighty river—back to England to fight for the motherland in her hour of need.

It was no accident in our own country that in 1916, when the German menace threatened, the old American stock was the first to sense the danger. Almost without exception, the men who roused us to action in 1915 and 1916, who sensed the threat to our institutions, Eliot, Roosevelt, Thayer, Wister, Cabot, Gardner, Putnam, Royce, were men of many generations in America. The old stock felt the threat instinctively. A newer American could feel it only by a sensitive imagination. I do not mean that the alien blood did not respond to the call. But the call was made by the old blood, which, generally speaking, sensed the danger first and led the way. When the great call came in 1917, it was noticeable and inevitable that our past called to us. Mr. Hagedorn himself, as I have noted, heard then the ghosts of our fathers calling to us "out of the holy ground," from "the hills of Gettysburg," and "the fields of Valley Forge." The poet in him responded to the feeling that was instinctive to those of a long past in this country. So always it is the ghosts of a country

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that help shape its destinies. A country without ghosts is simply not a nation. It is merely a place where so many millions live.

We have already developed a national tradition in America. We would not be a nation if we had not developed it. It is not as intense as that of England and France and yet it is a potent and a beautiful force. It is the tradition of the Puritan settler, the Maryland and Virginia cavalier, the English, Scotch and Scotch-Irish yeoman and artisans who came to New England, the Middle Colonies or the Southern States, the Dutch of New York and the German of Pennsylvania, who cleared the ground, built their stockades and forts, founded Harvard, William and Mary, and later Yale, Princeton, Williams and Amherst, fought the Indians, obtained religious and then political freedom, fought the Revolution and founded the new government.

It is the tradition of the long colonial wars, of savage Indian raids along the Connecticut, and the Mohawk, the tradition of Lexington, Concord, Brandywine, Valley Forge, Trenton and Cowpens, of Paul Jones and Yorktown. It is the tradition of Daniel Boone, and Kit Carson, the founding of the Middle Western settlements, the clearing of the forests, the draining of swamps, of the great Lincoln-Douglas debates, of Bull Run and Antietam, of Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, of Gettysburg, of the Wilderness and Cold Harbor and finally of Appomattox Court House.

It is the tradition of the common law, of the first

WHAT IS A NATION?

state legislatures, of countless elections, of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation, Washington's Farewell Address, the Gettysburg Address, of government by representative bodies under the control of law.

It is this tradition that makes America. It is such a tradition that makes any nation—the sense of oneness, of like-mindedness, of community of spirit, of unity through the past.

But manifestly such a tradition is only built up over a long period of time. It takes generations to create the history on which it is based, and that history slowly permeates and molds the people. Some of us fondly imagine that the national tradition can be taught in the schools and in books. But such teachings are not enough alone. As a friend who read these words remarked, after all, it is oral tradition which makes a people conscious of its past. The father telling his children or grandchildren of Gettysburg, of the pioneer trip through the Cumberland Gap, the old soldier telling the village children of his battles, the old settler of the conquering of the wilderness—all these slowly create a national tradition. A friend on an Indiana railroad some fifteen years ago was told by a railroad trainman that the cupboard in the old home was made out of the flat boat on which the family first came up the Ohio. The symbols of the past in the home, the old musket or Civil War sword, the old fowling piece, the old

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

spinning wheel, all bring the past to us and give meaning and coherence to the present.

Esmein, the French political scientist, eloquently states this theory that a nation is a slow and a long evolution. He declares that "the formation and the development of a nation are not an artificial creation, but a natural phenomenon, of which the conditions are the race, the milieu, and the historical circumstances. Each nation develops thus by an evolution which is natural to it, and gives itself its structure, its political organism, and its particular genius, as an animal creates successively its organs and its intelligence. More, each nation thus formed, has truly a sort of life of its own, distinct from the sum of the lives of the individuals who compose it at a given moment, where are combined the activity and the thought of generations past with those of the present generation, where prepares the destiny of the generations to come."⁴

4. THE ATTACK ON TRADITION—IDEALS FOR THE FUTURE VERSUS IDEALS FROM THE PAST

The nation, then, comes out of the past. To me this seems axiomatic. But there are those who deny it. Thus Walter Lippman wrote a few years ago that:

tradition will not work in the complexity of modern life. For if you ask Americans to remain true to the traditions of all their Fathers, there would be a pretty confusion if they followed your advice. There is great confusion as it is, due in

⁴ Esmein, *Eléments de droit constitutionnel*, Vol. I, p. 295.

WHAT IS A NATION?

large measure to the persistency with which we follow tradition in a world unsuited to it. They modify a bit, however, they apply the 'rule of reason' to their old loyalties, and so a little adjustment is possible. But there can be no real cohesion for America in following scrupulously the inherited ideals of our people. Between the Sons of the Revolution, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Orangemen, the plantation life of the South, the refugees from Russia, the Balkan Slavs, there is in their traditions a conflict of prejudice and custom that would make all America as clamorous as the Stock Exchange on a busy day. Nor is there going to be lasting inspiration for Bulgarian immigrants in the legend of the Mayflower.

The only possible cohesion now is a loyalty that looks forward. America is preeminently the country, where there is practical substance in Nietzsche's advice that we should live not for our fatherland, but for our children's land.

To do this men have to substitute purpose for tradition.⁵

Hermann Hagedorn, a fine example of a second generation American, in an appeal for a united America against the inroads of hyphenism, declared in a letter to the *New York Times*:

We cannot afford to waver in our determination that this shall be and shall remain a united people, where English, and German and French and Russian and Scandinavian and Italian and Greek and Slovak, stand shoulder to shoulder bound together by common devotion and not to something behind, but to something before; not to racial tradition, and a geographic entity, but to a great dream. In the light of that dream men may well throw behind them the sentimental attachments of the past, for what it offers them is a hundred-fold more valuable than what it asks them to reject—peace

⁵ Lippmann, *Drift and Mastery*, p. 265, Mitchell-Kennerly, 1914.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

in place of perpetual discord, the conception of 'all for each and each for all,' political and social equality, the freedom to rise.⁶

Rabbi Wise expresses the same belief. In attacking the quota law he declared that the House of Representatives took America to "mean a land or a geographical expression, forgetting that it was a political institution and a spiritual ideal."⁷ In another place he said: "Americanism is not a matter of birth or ancestry, for the American is self-made, not born. . . . America is not a place, not a religion, not a locality; America is an atmosphere, an ideal, a vision not yet fulfilled."⁸

Edward Bok likewise expresses resentment at the belief that one foreign-born is not as much an American as one whose people have been here for several generations.⁹ He quotes the traditional argument that after all we are all immigrants and that if we insist on ancestry as a test, only the American Indian can qualify as a real American. He proceeds to say that we

think of Americanism as something that we can imbibe, understand and practise in our lives only if we are born in the United States of America. We interpret America as a place, a locality, and think that only those who are born within its borders can be true Americans in their lives and follow the spirit of Americanism in their achievements.

But America in the truest sense is not a place on the map only; to be an American is possible to others besides the man

⁶ *New York Times*, March 30, 1921.

⁸ *Collier's Weekly*, March 19, 1923.

⁷ *Ibid.*, January 6, 1924.

⁹ Bok, *Twice Thirty*, p. 255.

WHAT IS A NATION?

born within certain geographical boundaries. Americanism is not alone a matter of birth or ancestry.

The real America is an ideal—a vision yet to be fulfilled.

The real American is he who feels that ideal, makes it a part of himself—and does his share and makes his contribution to the attainment of the goal and the clear realization of the ideal, whether he be born in the United States or thousands of miles from its borders. . . . Americanism is of one's inner self: a God-given responsibility, a faith, a trust in one's fellow-men, stronger than a belief in one's self, a tenacious, unswerving confidence in service.

That Americanism is something affirmed, and it would even seem the louder it is affirmed the truer it is, appears constantly in the arguments of the immigrants and their friends in depreciation of the native stock. They are constantly saying or implying that the immigrants love Lincoln or the Constitution more than we do, although they are the very ones that say that our history cannot appeal to them. A Jew, speaking to a class of new citizens, declared: "Those who oppose the aliens must learn that many of you came over thirsty for the spirit for which America stands. What becomes commonplace to the native, because of his long association with it, is deliverance for you. Freedom is the American fetish, yet the foreigner grasps that freedom in an exultant spirit known to but few of the native-born Americans." An American of the old stock addressing immigrants actually declared: "The conservators and believers in American ideals seem to be our immigrants. To the Russian Jew, Abraham Lincoln is a god."

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Apparently, to judge from common expressions of American opinion, the European is a degenerate, a pauper slave, a quarrelsome brawler, always seeking war. No contempt is too great to be cast upon him. This is rather surprising in view of the fact that thirty percent of our population are those very degenerates or their sons and daughters. But once this pauper slave lands at Ellis Island, he becomes a sort of demigod. There is, then, of course a vested interest in him. He reads newspapers and votes and goes to the movies. Then he is told that he is infinitely superior to the native stock, that he is more of an idealist than the native son, that he is more of an American, that he loves Lincoln and the Constitution more than the native-born. It would seem, therefore, that the more recent an immigrant is, the better an American he is. If that is so, there must be something vitally wrong with America for the longer a family stays here the more it degenerates. Even on this theory, then, if Americanism is simply the affirmation of an ideal, there must be something wrong with the ideal or else something more than an ideal is necessary, for apparently we have an ideal which only new arrivals can retain.

But speaking more seriously, there is a vast confusion of thought in all this discussion of Americanism which is admirably illustrated in the assertions that the old stock needs Americanization as much as, if not more, than the immigrant. Thus Emory S. Bogardus, Professor of Sociology in the University of

WHAT IS A NATION?

California, in his book entitled, *Essentials of Americanization*, says:

The native born and the foreign born alike must experience the process of Americanization. In the case of natives, Americanization involves getting acquainted with the best American traditions and current standards and practising and trying to improve the quality of these traditions and standards. In the case of the foreign born, Americanization means giving up one set of well-known and in part precious loyalties for another set of loyalties more or less unknown. . . . The first group to respond to Americanization, then, must be native born Americans. With Americanism understood by all native Americans and stated in terms ranging from personal to world-wide democracy, Americanization can go forward.¹⁰

Mr. Edward Hale Bierstadt in his *Aspects of Americanization* says: "If Americanization is ever to become a sincerely constructive force in our national life, it must begin with the native Americans."¹¹

Mr. Bogardus quotes Mrs. Mary Simkovitch as believing that "the colonial hyphenated American has perhaps as little understanding of Americanism as has a member of a foreign born hyphenated group. In her work for many years on the East side of New York City, she has come to believe that the average immigrant becomes a more ardent patriot even under adverse conditions than some plain Americans of colonial stock."¹²

¹⁰ Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization*, p. 16, 24 Univ. of So. Calif. Press.

¹¹ Bierstadt, *Aspects of Americanization*, p. 123, Stewart Kidd Co.

¹² Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization*, p. 119.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Why not all Americans of colonial stock? for that is what is implied, by innuendo at least.

Of course, it is folly to say that the American of colonial stock needs Americanizing. He may need making over in a hundred different ways, he may even be a poor citizen, but it is a hopeless confusion of terms to say that he needs Americanizing. If after two or three hundred years in this country those of the colonial stock are not Americans, nobody is or ever can be. The trouble all lies in a false test of Americanism. Some of the definers of the word "Americanism" make it the affirmance of an ideal. They frame the ideal themselves and then all those who do not subscribe to it are not good Americans. Others erect a standard of conduct based on that ideal or some other ideal, and then those who do not live up to that ideal are not good Americans. As the immigrant has not had time to prove that he has not lived up to the ideal, he is fairly safe on the test of salvation by works, and on the test of salvation by faith he scores one hundred percent if he subscribes to the ideal chosen.

How false the standards are is easily seen when we apply them to other countries. No one would think of saying that forty million Englishmen whose people have been there for a thousand years or more are not Englishmen simply because they do not live up to the ideals of Milton or Pym or Burke or Gladstone. No one would think of saying that forty million Frenchmen are not Frenchmen because they do not live up to the ideal of "Liberty, Fraternity

WHAT IS A NATION?

and Equality." No one, in fact, lives up to all his ideals. If he does, there is something wrong with the ideals.

Nor do we all have the same ideals. There are Englishmen to-day to whom the ideals of Cromwell, Sir John Eliot and Burke are abhorrent, but nevertheless they are Englishmen. An American who went to England and proclaimed that he was the devoted slave of the ideals of the Petition of Right, religious toleration and free manhood suffrage, would not become more of an Englishman than some doughty Tory squire who did not believe in them. This does not mean that Englishmen or Frenchmen or Americans cannot be improved. It does not mean that the colonial stock is sacrosanct. But, as a friend said to me, because a breed of horses is not ideal does not mean that they are not horses.

To base Americanism on affirmation of an ideal is to subject it to a varying standard. The ideal of England of H. G. Wells is not that of Austen Chamberlain; that of Tom Mann or A. J. Cook is not that of G. K. Chesterton. Yet it is hard to see how it can be said that they are not all Englishmen. The ideal of America held by Jane Addams is not that of Henry Fairchild Osborn. One believes in a sort of continental state made up of the peoples of all lands. The other believes in a coherent America formed by a more or less unified racial stock. Yet they are certainly both Americans. Surely I can say without being patronizing that the definition of Rabbi Wise leaves much unsaid for one whose people

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

have been in this country two hundred and seventy-five years. America means to those who have been here so long that literally they do not know where their ancestors came from, an ideal, yes, but above all a homeland, a tradition. It is bone of their bone, sinew of their sinew. It is they and they are it. It is not an allegiance assumed, not one which can be affirmed by an oath however sincere and heartfelt.

Yet America *is* an ideal, or rather many ideals. But where do those ideals come from? Even Dr. Wise and Mr. Bok do not draw their ideals of America from the air. The ideals come from the past. They come from Plymouth Rock and Boston Common, from the Haverhill massacre, from the hazy camp fires of the pioneers, from the Lincoln-Douglas debates, from the caravans of the Oregon trail, from the Battle of the Little Big Horn. The ideal of government of the people, for the people and by the people, the ideal of representative institutions, the ideal of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the ideals of the Bill of Rights, are the products of time, of history, of struggles sacred to the memory of generations of Americans leading back through centuries to the mother country, not only of half our population actually but of all of us in ideals of government, law and political tradition.

To separate the ideal from the past is impossible. The ideal comes from the past. It is the past.

No man can live by an ideal, as Mr. Bok and Rabbi Wise call it, or purpose as Mr. Lippmann calls it, alone. An ideal is necessary but it will not remain

WHAT IS A NATION?

a living force unless it is rooted in habits, in traditions, in institutions. A young man must have ideals but they are the product of long and arduous training. Only as the ideals become habits are they trustworthy. In time of crisis, the record of an honorable father or grandfather, the traditions taught in the home, are an enormous force of encouragement and integration of spirit. The man will fail unless his past is secure. So a nation cannot live merely by an affirmation of faith. The faith not only comes out of the past, but the past furnishes the habits, the customs, the traditions of centuries to sustain and nourish it.

Barrett Wendell used to say that it took one hundred years at least to make an American. He believed "that no one can be called a true American who retains a particle of direct personal tradition not native to this country. Immigrants, however worthy, bring other than American traditions from their old countries. Something of these, their children are apt to preserve, sometimes their grandchildren. Only when these traditions have faded into dim knowledge of whence a family came—without any definite personal memories—can full American nationality declare itself. Generally this takes at least a hundred years."¹³ Again he referred to Lowell as "American in that deepest sense which means that a man has no vestige of personal tradition not wholly native."¹⁴ Again, "As to America you know

¹³ *Barrett Wendell and His Letters*, p. 254, Atlantic Monthly Press.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

my long opinion—that no person can be of any nation who feels bound to any other.”¹⁵ In short, he believed that it takes four generations until the immigrant does not know whence he came, four generations until this land and no other is his, four generations until its traditions are a spontaneous part of him.

Mr. Bok freely admits that he does not meet this definition. Rather he frankly rejects the definition. He is still a devoted Hollander. He declares: “The point which American boys of foreign parentage cannot understand, however, and it is natural they should not, is that when a man is born in one country and adopts another, he always is and remains of two countries. . . . A man always remains what he was born! Not in feeling or in spirit, perhaps, but in fact.”¹⁶

Mr. Bok is entirely right. It is true that it is unnatural to expect a man born in one country to renounce that country. He does in truth remain always partly of that country. But no better proof of our point could be asked for. It is simply that it is psychologically impossible for a man born abroad ever to get the single American viewpoint.

But Mr. Bok and many more in his position insist that this does not prevent him from being as good an American as one who has six generations of ancestors in this country behind him and cannot definitely tell whence his people came. Indeed, he says that to deny him the title of American is to deny it to those with the six generations, because their ances-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

¹⁶ Bok, *Twice Thirty*, p. 251.

WHAT IS A NATION?

tors were immigrants once, and he repeats the favorite hackneyed illustration of the immigrant and his friends, that the Red Indian is the only real American. This argument surely should be retired on a pension. If the fact that however distant in time one's ancestors came to this country prevents one being an American, perhaps the Red Indian is likewise excluded. We do not know that he grew here and it is likely that at some far distant period he emigrated here. Indeed, since the animals may have migrated here also, the trees and vegetation are the only natives. One might as well say that the descendants of the Normans are not English, or that the descendants of the Angles, Saxons and Danes are not English because the Britons were there before them. Indeed, the Britons would have to give way before the Neanderthal man. The Puritans surely were not Americans. They were English. Winthrop and Endicott were English. Nor were the sons or grandsons of the first settlers Americans. Not until one hundred and fifty years after the founding of Plymouth did a national consciousness arise. National consciousness and the legal fact of nationality came together and it was no accident that they did. It took one hundred and fifty years to make the first American. Indeed, there are many who feel that while the men of the Revolution became legally and by affirmation Americans, they did not become Americans in their deepest consciousness. Lowell solemnly felt that Lincoln was the first American. He felt, in short, that it took seventy-five years from

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the time when severance was made before the old tradition was supplanted by the new. As we have seen, the opponents of restriction insist that the colonial stock is not yet American. Their dearest jibe, stimulated usually by the acts and words of the old stock when the old American tradition speaks strongest in them, is that the old stock is colonial, "deliciously colonial." They insist that after one hundred and fifty years of independence and three hundred years on this continent, the colonial stock is still in effect alien. It is really only native. But at least they cannot quarrel, then, with a statement that it will take one hundred years to give an alien, who comes not from Britain but from a land of alien speech and ways, a native background.

The difficulty is that immigrants take the statement that they are not Americans as an assertion of inferiority, that they are not as good citizens or good fathers, that they are not as "good as anyone else." They have been hurt by the noisy claims of those they like to call the "hundred percenters." Even a kindly statement that an immigrant is not an American is sure to be keenly resented. Congressman William S. Bennett, testifying before the Senate Committee, said: "And I want to say right here that I have made a good many mild enemies in this country by saying what I still believe, that no man born in a foreign country, coming here after forty years of age, ever gets to be as good an American citizen as one born here. My friend Mr. Husband over there wanted to lick me at one time because his father was

WHAT IS A NATION?

born over there, and he said that he was as good an American citizen as there ever was."¹⁷

This is a much milder judgment than that of Barrett Wendell. But Mr. Wendell did not imply any criticism of or reflection on the character of the immigrant as a man by saying that it takes one hundred years to make an American. He did not mean that the immigrant or his children or grandchildren are not good husbands or fathers, or that they do not vote intelligently and with high motives. He simply meant that a man does not think as an American as long as he has a definite attachment to another country. He meant that an American is one who thinks with a native background, whose law is American law, whose prejudices are American prejudices, whose political thinking has American roots.

It is simply a fact that while perhaps sensitive and imaginative men may be able to catch the feeling and spirit of a country without being long immersed in its atmosphere, for the mass of men it is psychologically impossible to feel and think with a native background simply by willing to do so. One would, indeed, argue little for the stability of character of the immigrant and the force of the tradition of his own land if one said that he could throw off at will the old skin of emotions and habits and take on a new one. Indeed, the immigrants and their friends have been bitter in their attacks on much of our Americanization program just because they say that it is based on the false psychology of rapid conversion to

¹⁷ Senate Hearings, Committee on Immigration, 1921, p. 314.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

strange ways and thoughts. Surely, if Charles W. Eliot or Theodore Roosevelt had gone to England or France at twenty-five years of age, they could not in their lifetime have become English of the English or French of the French. The native psychology, the native traditions and customs, they could not have adopted by any act of affirmation however fervent. An English yeoman, or a French peasant proprietor not so well educated—not so idealistic, perhaps—would have been more English or French as the case may be than they. Why then, is it so much easier to obtain the American background?

But it is not necessary to base the argument on the definition of an American. Such definitions are apt to cause heartburnings and to shunt the argument onto sidings. Most of us, of course, would agree that no man should call himself an American who votes in American politics as an Irishman or a German or an Italian to aid the Irish in Ireland, the Germans in Germany or the Italians in Italy. Such a man may be more intelligent than a farm laborer of the native stock, but if the farm laborer votes for native reasons—even with native prejudices—he is an American and the others are not.

But aside from this limitation, it will only avoid confusion of thought and unnecessary disagreement if we call all others Americans, all but those who avowedly act as aliens in our politics and even refer to themselves as Irish or Germans or Italians or Greeks, or by hyphenated terms.

But whatever the verdict may be as to any par-

WHAT IS A NATION?

ticular individual, it is surely clear that no country can be a coherent and harmonious nation where the majority at least does not have a common tradition and a common past. We can allow a portion of the population to be aliens, a portion to be of alien descent who no longer have an alien bias, who no longer take part in alien or hyphenated groups, but who are not yet immersed in the American tradition so that it is an instinctive part of them. But the nation requires and America requires surely at least a majority of people who are wholly native, who think with a native background, to whom the tradition of the country has been passed down for many generations. It depends on like-mindedness, a community of essential standards, a common tradition and a common past.

We now have in this country but forty-seven million white persons who trace to 1790. If immigration had been allowed to continue in unchecked quantities until the probable limit of two hundred million was reached, with that old stock competing against foreign stock in the birth-rate, we should have by the year 2000 perhaps thirty or forty millions who could trace back to the Revolution, and one hundred and sixty or seventy who dated back for various periods from twenty to one hundred years in span, and they would have been composed, perhaps, ten million each of sixteen different nationalities.

Our question, then, is simply (leaving all questions of comparative ability aside) whether, granting that

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

any one of the racial groups which in 1920 were furnishing a floodtide to our shores could have made a great nation on this continent if not interfered with by other nationalities, seventeen can do it when all are about equal in numerical strength and the old dominant stock is numerically submerged. Our question is whether we should not, in that steady, remorseless process of pouring tides of peoples of different races, lose the country we already have and not achieve another until, after long generations, a new unity is achieved.

CHAPTER VII

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

I. THE MAKING OF FRANCE

I REALIZE that there are many who minimize the divergent effects of race. Every country of Europe, they declare, is a composite of many races. The ancient differences in the racial content of European nations have not prevented them from forming unified peoples with definite national traditions. Thus, France is the product of the prehistoric Iberian and Ligurian peoples upon whom were superimposed the Nordic Celts, and then the Franks, Burgundians and Normans. Funck-Brentano estimates, in his brilliant *Les origines* that in the formation of the French nation, of every one hundred natives fifty were contributed by the Ligurians and Iberians, twenty by the Celts, sixteen by the "Germans," namely Franks and Burgundians, including the Goths, four by the Normans and five by Greeks, Basques, Jews, Syrians and Africans. He summarizes the process thus:

Already we have seen a number of different races superimpose themselves on the soil of our country since the paleolithics who themselves were perhaps not natives; then have come the Indo-Europeans and the Scandinavians, then the Iberians, the Ligurians, the Celts; the Romans will be added to them by conquest, the Goths and the Germans by invasion, the Syrians and the Jews by infiltration, the Hungarians, the

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Saracens as pillagers, the Normans as pillagers and then as colonizers. . . .

As the soil on which it is developed, the French people has thus formed itself also, in its race, in its customs, in its language, by successive deposits,—to take only the principal ones one could count a dozen diverse elements of which each has contributed for its part, of that which it had of the most salient, of the most original, of the most vivacious and the strongest, to this magnificent ensemble, which the centuries of common life, of coordinated efforts and anguishes shared together, of battles sustained side by side, have built into an incomparable union; the nation, the language and the civilization of France.¹

Surely, here was a racial mixture, yet France is a nation—one in feeling and tradition, a beautiful example of exalted national unity.

France has achieved that result, yet how long has she been in doing it? It has not been done in one or two or even four generations. France has been more or less of an entity since the days of Celtic Gaul before the days of Cæsar. It was not united, but it had a civilization of richness and brilliancy. The Celtic Nordics came to France between the fifth and the sixth centuries before Christ. Then came Cæsar whom to this day Funck-Brentano cannot forgive for his treacherous and ruthless conquest, which crushed the divergent elements of France and made it one, though conquered. The great Teutonic invasions of Franks and Burgundians began about 411 A. D., though infiltrations of the Teutonic tribes had

¹ Funck-Brentano, *Les origines*, p. 29.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

begun as early as 100 B. C. They settled on the land, established the feudal system, organized in each county a hierarchy of their own, in which the previous arrivals were subordinated by force of arms to the conquering aristocracy.

Charlemagne brought all France under one authority. In the great *Song of Roland* the poet tells how the amalgamation was brought about:

By his sword Durandal, he cries, "I have conquered Anjou and Bretagne, by it I have conquered Poitou and Le Maine. I have conquered for him Normandy the free, and by it I have conquered for him La Provence and Aquitaine, and Lombardy and all Romagne. I have conquered for him Bavaria, and all of Flanders. . . ."

It was a unity achieved by fire and sword and not by gentle amalgamation. In the song Roland often refers to "douce France," the lovely phrase which like "Merrie England" has come down the centuries as a token of national love, a symbol of unity in an undivided and happy allegiance. But we must not think that there was then a national feeling in France, nor in 1100 when the song was written. As Henry Adams says in his *Chartres Cathedral*, France did not mean our France to Roland—"douce France" meant to him and to the poet of three centuries later a much narrower France than that of to-day. Roland, says Henry Adams, was like Hugh Capet, a liegeman of St. Denis and French to the heart. "France to him, was St. Denis, and at the most the

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Ile de France, but not Anjou or even Maine.”² These were the countries he had conquered with Durandal, but they were not France. Funck-Brentano says the same thing. “When the Song of Roland will sing of douce France, it is the Ile de France which it has in mind.”

But Charlemagne did make of these conquered countries or provinces a temporary political or military unity, at least. Funck-Brentano admits that he has “certainly realized an immense work. Let us represent to ourselves this mixture, this pell mell of races, of chiefs of tribes, of lord bishops in their cities, of great sovereign proprietors in their domains, this multitude of men attached to different institutions, traditions and customs; of many different languages also, and of this formidable medley Charlemagne has made a coherent whole. That which explains the work of Charlemagne is assuredly his energy, his robust will, his tireless activity, but also the fact that this work remains superficial. Under an apparent submission, each local authority conserved its autonomy in the canton where it was established. It reigned independently of the emperor, the sovereign bishop in his city, the proprietor in his domain, the count even in his county. . . .

“Thus is explained the extent and the éclat of the Carolingian work, and also its fragility. Never has one seen so great an Empire, apparently so well constructed, collapse with such rapidity.”

² *Mont St. Michel and Chartres*, Henry Adams, p. 27, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

There was then the beginning of a unity under Charlemagne but it was not real, not permanent, not founded in the roots of the country though four hundred years had passed since the conquest of Clovis. But after Charlemagne came anarchy and weakness. Little enough do we know of the next succeeding centuries. A few lines from the opening paragraphs of Funck-Brentano's *Le moyen âge* should suffice to show us how chaotic the interregnum was. The Norsemen came and devastated the country.

The night of the ninth century. What transpires? Hardly do the documents allow us to envisage a scattered people without order. The barbarians have broken the dikes. In successive floods the Saracen invaders have spread themselves over the Midi. The Hungarians crowd the provinces of the east. . . . By the streams the Normans from the North press almost to the center of France, sailing the ocean like pirates. . . . There is no longer any commerce. Terror incessant. With a fearful heart men erect henceforth only wooden buildings. There is no longer any architecture. From the time of Charlemagne, even under his great authority, one can see a society in dissolution, and what disorder will continue to boil after him! At the end of the tenth century does there exist a particle, however little, of the conditions social or economic, established in Gaul by the Romans, or even crudely introduced after them by the barbarians?

All is modified. The Monk Paul, who lived in the eleventh century, speaks of a collection of maps of which the most ancient dated from the ninth century. 'What changes. The rolls conserved in the armory of our abbey show that the peasants of that time lived under customs of which those who live to-day know no more. The very words they used, are not those of the present day.'

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

And later on:

'I have found the names of places, of persons, of things changed since then to such a point that not only are they abolished, but that it is no longer possible to identify them; far from having conserved them, men do not know them.'

And Funck-Brentano concludes:

The bonds which served to unite the inhabitants of the country, have been broken; the laws customary or legislative have been broken; society is no more governed by anything.³

It is clear that so disorganized a society could not reorganize itself nationally. It had to be built up from small units, cell to cell and group to group. It had to start with the family. The family, Funck-Brentano continues, becomes

a man's country—the texts of the time call it *patria*,—and each loves it with a love so much more intense because he has it all around him. He sees it live; he feels immediately its force and beauty, and its sweetness also. . . . Thus form the sentiments of solidarity which will unite—one with another,—the members of the family. The prosperity of one of them will assure that of his relatives, the honor of one will be the honor of the other and consequently the shame of one will recoil on all the members of the 'band.'

These sentiments will fortify themselves, will develop themselves, will gain greater and greater power in the measure that the family itself will take a greater development, in the measure that the tasks accomplished by grace of it, will possess more *éclat* when the 'home' will have been constructed and the relationship extended.

³ Funck-Brentano, *Le moyen âge*, pp. 1-3.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

The family, the "living cell out of which France has come," thus develops into the *mesine* which comprises the family, reunited about the chief of the principal branch, the servitors and all those who live about, by or for the house. The *mesine* develops into the fief, over which the seigneur is chief.

The members of this enlarged family are united in a sort of corporation; they lend each other mutual assistance; they have their tribunal which is the tribunal of the seigneur, that is to say, of the chief of the family; they have their customs, their manners, their traditions, they have their standard, that is to say their war-cry, they have their gonfanon, of which the iron point is gilded, they take the same name, the name of the seigneur, of the chief of the family; they form the *mesine* as such.

Finally, several fiefs make the great fief, the provinces like Burgundy and Normandy.

The king, meanwhile, who had been so powerful in the days of Charlemagne, had fallen into a position of contempt. Finally the power began to group itself about Hugh Capet, the duke of the Île de France. Eventually, he became king. But he was really king only of the Île de France. It is only in the second half of the twelfth century, as Funck-Brentano remarks, that the king will be able to make his authority "recognized by the chiefs from whom the great fiefs are named. In the tenth century, then, France is formed by the hierarchical grouping of a multitude of little states, each an aggregate of principalities, of variable dimensions, and importance,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

which join themselves to each other and superimpose themselves on the thousands and thousands of families which form the base, each among them strongly constituted under the authority of its natural chief, until the summit where is found the king, himself, the chief of a family, exercising on the other chiefs of families, the feudal seigneurs, a paternal authority. This authority, which is essentially a moral authority, forms the sole bond which unites these thousand upon thousand of little states, each to each other, and it forms the national unity."⁴

The nation was forming again, though the great duchies or provinces were still independent in power and spirit.

By the time of Philip Augustus, the king came to have royal power directly over a large part of France. Some duchies and comtés came to him by inheritance or marriage and some by conquest. He began the first great centralization. He sent out the baillis, the precursors of the later intendants. They were at the same time judges, administrators, and collectors of revenues.

The slow process of unification went on until the Hundred Years' War. France, feeling its growing unity, and its nascent nationality, produced the chansons de geste, the cathedrals, chivalry, the Crusades, all the expression of a people which began to have common standards and traditions.

But this process was too fast to be permanent. To quote Funck-Brentano again: "The royal power had

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

neither the time, nor the means, to assimilate these successive accretions, and so arise the numerous divergences, the inevitable dissensions between the provinces and the royal domaine."⁵ The English kings, in France the dukes of Guienne and Aquitaine, favored the people of those duchies, and in the Hundred Years' War these people, until near the end, were on the English side. The war was a social war. In short, the people were not yet a French nation. "In all the first half of the war of One Hundred Years, till the beginning of the 14th Century, one can be certain, that when a city pronounces for the king of France that the aristocratic party, the patriciate, supported by its clientele, is in the ascendancy; when on the contrary, a locality turns 'Anglais' it is the popular party that has taken in hand the direction of the city."⁶ France was divided between Armagnacs and Burgundians, the first favoring the French, the latter the English. Gradually, the sentiment formed against the invader. It was Jeanne d'Arc who called forth or freed the national sentiment. It really needed only the magnetic flash of her personality to set into flame the long smoldering vapors.

An able statement of the slowness with which the French national spirit fermented and coalesced is given by Albert Leon Guerard in his *French Civilization from its Origin to the Close of the Middle Ages*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 411.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

There had been [he says] a vague 'Francia' which meant the realm of the Franks, then was later a Duchy of France, between the Seine and the Loire, which was the personal domain of the Capetians, but France in any modern sense of the term, did not exist in 987 [when Capet became king]. . . . The actual power of the French king was almost nihil outside of his own restricted estate; his theoretical suzerainty, until the middle of the fourteenth century, did not exist beyond the right bank of the Rhone. Lyons itself remained for centuries a city of the Empire. Burgundy and Lorraine, terms of ever-changing connotation, were vacillating between the French and the German spheres, and it seemed likely, at one time, that they would constitute a third individual group as in the days of Lothair. The continental possessions of the English kings were part of the French political system only in the most shadowy fashion; the great city of Bordeaux remained continuously under English rule from 1154 to 1453. Southern France was a different world altogether, even after its ruthless conquest by the Northern crusaders of Montfort. The Duke of Brittany was in fact independent and his land did not finally revert to the French crown until the end of the fifteenth century. . . . France in the 10th century was not even an intelligible geographical expression like Italy before 1859. It was not nature, race or the desire of the people that made one nation out of Bretons, Gascons, and Lorrainers; it was history. It might be excessive to say that the Capetian dynasty created France, since all the elements were at hand; but it did provide the indispensable centre of crystallization. The royal domain, monarchical power, patriotic consciousness grew together and inseparably. In so far as it is possible to write a connected history of France in the Middle Ages, one must trace the steps of the three-fold evolution. The acquisition of a new province, the creation of a new organ of government, the first gleam of a national sentiment, these are facts

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

that loom large in our eyes, because they have moulded the France that we know.⁷

The essential localism is vividly illustrated by the state of the law. In the beginning, law was tribal. Men were governed by the law of their clan. Law was not territorial. The *Lex Salica*, says F. W. Maitland, "for example, was not the law of a district, it was the law of a race. The Swabian, wherever he might be, lived under his Alemannic law, or, as an expressive phrase tells us, he lived Alemannic law. So Roman law was the law of the Roman. In a famous, if exaggerated sentence, Bishop Agobard, of Lyons, has said that often five men would be walking or sitting together and each of them would own a different law."⁸ Edward Jenks adds, "The oldest part of the *Lex Ribuaria* contains the following conclusive passage, 'This also we determine, that a Frank, a Burgundian or an Alemann or in whatever nation he shall have dwelt, when accused in court, in the Riburian country, shall answer according to the law of the place where he was born.'"⁹

As the tribes settled and the populations coalesced, law became territorial; all men in a certain territory had the same law. The law, in short, became a product of the fief. But law was still local. It was not national. Each fief had its own law. "Everywhere," says Calisse, "law became territorial and locally uni-

⁷ Guerard, *French Civilization from Its Origin to the Close of the Middle Ages*, pp. 135-6.

⁸ Jenks, *Select Essays in Anglo-American Public Law*, p. 20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

form. Local conditions, particularly the proportions of the various races, determined which it should be."

So the process of fusion, of intermarriage, of integration went on. It was a melting-pot, perhaps, but it was not a democratic melting-pot, and the heat was not intense but steady and resistless. The process, through a thousand years from the time of Charlemagne, has been slow and glacier-like in its advance. Until the French Revolution, the political rulers did not have to take into account, directly at least, the political wishes of their constituents. The Count or the Duke or the King did not have to cater to the Iberian or the Ligurian vote. The kings began to appoint intendants who exercised the central governing power over the provinces. The provinces were drained of their most ambitious nobility. France became a centralized monarchy with little local self-government. And yet, when the Revolution came, she was still criss-crossed with local customs. The law was local and not national. Napoleon cut all these bands with his conqueror's sword. He abolished old sinecures, old administrative privileges, and promulgated the Code Napoléon which for the first time gave a national law to France. "Only the Revolution," says Edward Jenks, "brought unity to France, a real common law."¹⁰

So, after fifteen hundred years, France became a nation with one parliament, one law, one language, one tradition. As Guerard says, . . . "The land

¹⁰ Jenks, *Select Essays in Anglo-American Legal History*, p. 6.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

slowly moulds the people; the people with patient toil, alter the face of the land, clearing forests, draining marshes, the fields, building roads, and rearing cities, they humanize the landscape after their own image. Thus after countless generations, there results the perfected product, the Nation, land, people, body and soul, bound together by immeasurable and subtle ties."

Yet, to this day, the cleavage in many essential respects between *Langue d'oc* and *Langue d'oïl*, between Normandy and Gascony persists. It shows itself in politics. The gentler and yet intenser South is still ruled and looked down upon by the dominant North and still resents it. It showed itself in jealousies in the World War.

France, then, has been made one only after two thousand years of patient and sometimes turbulent evolution. Differences of race in her constituent elements may now conduce to her variety and her charm, but they did not hasten or aid her development into a nation. They delayed it.

Perhaps this sketch of the growth of France may seem overlong and out of proportion in this book. I have elaborated on her history for the very reason that her population was diverse. It was not as diverse as ours would have been if free immigration had been allowed to continue, but it was far more diverse than that of Norway or Denmark, or Scotland, or even England. Her history is an admirable example of the time and suffering that is necessary to achieve national unity out of racial diversity. France, in

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

short, is a striking example of a melting-pot nation and of the simple truth, too often ignored or forgotten, that the melting-pot takes centuries of time to do its work. I heard an American army officer recently tell of the reply he made to the jibe of a Frenchman a year or so before the United States entered the war, that we were not a nation but a mere collection of diverse races. He asked the Frenchman what people France had in the northeast. The Frenchman replied that originally they were Teutons. He asked what the people were in the southwest and was told that they were Basques. In the center, and was told that they were the Gauls. In Normandy, and was told that originally they were Scandinavians. In the south, and the Frenchman answered "God knows what." But the Frenchman said, "They are all Frenchmen." So the American general replied, "And we are all Americans."

But we have just seen that it took a thousand years after the last great invasions to make them all Frenchmen, and still after fifteen hundred years differences persist.

2. THE MAKING OF ENGLAND

Next let us look at England. Here is a nation formed of different races which has achieved a splendid nationality, perhaps the most vigorous, full-bodied and intense of the modern world. I shall not here consider the ethnological aspects of England's melting-pot. We have already pointed out that her constituent elements were far from heterogeneous. I

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

intend to treat here only the process of political and social unification, the melting-pot of customs and habits and political institutions. The English unification has now been going on some fifteen hundred years. The Anglo-Saxon conquest of England was completed by about 500 A. D. For close to six hundred years after the Anglo-Saxon conquest the various Anglo-Saxon nations struggled to unite England under one leadership. These tribes were of close kinship to each other, and yet they never achieved unity. For six hundred years England remained a heptarchy and for the greater part of that time it was a heptarchy in fact. First Northumberland obtained the overlordship; then Mercia, then Wessex. Weakened by this internal strife, and betrayed by the treachery of her jealous leaders, England fell under the power of Sweyn and Canute and finally the great and splendid Harold himself was beaten by William the Conqueror, largely because he had to fight two enemies at once.

There is no need to repeat the story of the Conquest. The ruthless brutality of William brought unity, a legal and political unity which has never since been broken. It was a unity brought to pass by fire and sword. Yorkshire was harried till it became a desert. The land of England was divided among William's feudal lords. Itinerant justices were established and the king's law was in a real measure enforced, although the local courts remained strong for centuries.

But the separation between Norman and English

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

continued for generations. In the beginning, as in France, law was racial although it was also national. There was one law for the Englishman, one law for the Norman. The English were tried by ordeal by fire and water and by compurgation, the Normans by ordeal by battle, and we have noted the distinction made by the law of Englishry.

Gradually, through centuries, the slow amalgamation went on. It was nurtured in parliament, among the bowmen who formed the first true modern infantry, in the folklore and the ballads of the people. We see the nascent growth of a national feeling in the ballads of Robin Hood and the poetry of Chaucer. As in France, "douce France" was the symbol of a unifying love, so in England was "Merrie England."

This love of country received first that passionate expression, which is typical of its modern force, in Shakespeare, whose lovely lyric to England, "that precious stone set in a silver sea," is one of the most exquisite expressions of the pure love of country in our language. In the "great and spacious days" of Elizabeth, the English spirit waxed strong and burst into glory in the fight with the Spanish Armada and many a fight on the Spanish Main. It burned strong in Raleigh and Drake and "my Lord" Howard, in Clive and the great Empire builders. It burns strong to-day in the sons of England scattered in Australia, South Africa and Canada and a hundred settlements "east of Suez." They dream of returning to England as a wanderer dreams of returning home. And in

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

the World War this intense flame could not be satisfied until it brought them back by the hundreds of thousands to fight for the mother country in the bloody salient and at Gallipoli.

But the Union of Britain and especially of the United Kingdom was slower in arriving, and in a sense that of the United Kingdom has never arrived. On the north, the antagonism between kindred races, for the lowland Scotch and the border English were surely brothers under the skin, manifested itself for centuries in border raids and battles which have been perpetuated to us in ringing ballads of the borderland. The battles of Homildon, Hallidon Hill, Neville's Cross, Bannockburn; in the Civil War, Dunbar and Worcester and later Culloden and Flodden are historic testimony of the bitterness and persistency of the feud. Only in the last one hundred and fifty years has peace reigned, and to this day the Scotch are fiercely jealous of their separate personality.

To hear Lloyd George speak of the Welsh is sufficient in itself to convince one of the permanence of their separation in the midst of the dominant English. Though the Welsh have been a part of Britain since the days of Edward I, they still maintain a fierce independence and pride of race. We hear to-day serious demands for home rule for Scotland and for Wales.

The South Irish, of course, have never become assimilated to the United Kingdom, despite all the plantations of English and Scotch settlers within the

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Pale. It will not do to blame English stupidity and cruelty for all the ills of Ireland. The fact is, of course, that there have been blunders and excesses on both sides. But it surely cannot be doubted that the chief cause for the blunders lay in a difference of race, a failure to understand the psychology of a different people.

English unity, then, has been making for fifteen hundred years. British unity was not achieved legally until 1700, twelve hundred years after Hengist and Horsa, and six hundred and forty years after the Conquest. Unity with respect to South Ireland has never been attained.

And yet England itself was a nation of allied races with only the submerged Iberian as an alien element; Scotland, herself, was in many ways more Anglo-Saxon and Norse than England.

3. THE FAILURE OF NATIONS WHERE HOMOGENEITY IS ABSENT

In the other countries of Europe, national unity has been even more difficult of attainment than in England and France. The great despotism of Russia fell to pieces in the crisis of the World War. From old Russia came Finland, part of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and part of post-war Roumania. Austria-Hungary fell to pieces. From it emerged Czecho-Slovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and part went to Roumania and Poland.

In the Balkans actual independence has come only in the last fifty years. But independence has not

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

brought tranquillity and, in the words of Meredith Nicholson, the standard beginning of a conversation in a railroad smoker for the past generation has been, "Sit over, neighbor; there is hell to pay in the Balkans." Two terrible wars were fought in 1912. The World War started in the Balkans and all the Balkan states were involved in it. And peace is not there yet. There are stirrings of trouble even as I write. In our characteristic American fashion of being very wise and superior to the troubles of others, we either laugh at the incessant quarrels in the Balkans and chide them patronizingly as children unable to maintain peace, or we ask them why they do not get together and form a federal union like ours. Yet there has always been a grievous mixture of populations in the Balkans. Even after the World War, we find that there are perhaps a million Bulgarians in Greece, Greeks in Bulgaria, Bulgarians in Yugoslavia, Bulgarians in Roumania and Roumanians in Bulgaria. Now I think it likely that if next to Indiana on the west were Bulgarians, on the east a state of Greeks, on the south Roumanians, with some of each nationality in Indiana, and some Indianians in each country, there might be continual friction between those states. I venture to say that Indianians would resent fiercely any foray by one of the other nationalities over its borders, that they would be inclined to go to the help of their fellow Indianians in the neighboring countries, and also that they would not receive tolerantly any supercilious comments on their childishness in not being more peace-loving,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

and I think finally that they would reject rather heatedly any suggestion that they unite in one country with the "Hunkies." Indeed, so baffling is the problem of races in the Balkan Peninsula and adjacent territory that the League of Nations, appalled as it was by the human misery and suffering involved in transferring one million Greeks from Asia Minor to Greece and about the same number of Turks from Greece to Asia Minor, solemnly said that it could see no other solution.

We have given this short argument to indicate that the formation of a nation out of diverse racial elements is a long and slow process, which is only achieved after bitter struggle and many generations, and which may never be achieved at all.

There is reason to believe that it may be much more easily lost than gained. Rome in the days of the Punic Wars was an Italian Republic. Italy was Rome and Italy was one. As she added to her conquests in Spain and Gaul and Greece, she added to her list of eligibles for the Senate, and not only were many provincial families ennobled, but they later supplied occupants of the Emperor's chair. But the new masses of population had not been made Roman. They thought they were Roman and that the Empire was Rome long after Rome had ceased to be. It would be presumptuous to say that any one cause was the cause or one of the chief causes of the decline and fall of Rome. The subject has been a matter of dispute for centuries. But certainly there is good opinion that one of the causes was the heterogeneity

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

of the population in the Empire. Ferrero notes again and again the blindness of the Emperors in throwing open to settlement to the barbarians area after area within the Empire. He refers to the "confusion of races, the accession to power of the ruder populations of the Empire, and the increasing influx of barbarians who established themselves in Roman territory" as one of the chief causes of the fall of the Empire.¹¹ Tenney Frank in his *A History of Rome* is more detailed. After considering the political phase of the decline he adds:

Not the least in importance in the catalogue of altering factors is the gradual change of race at Rome. The old stock of Italy had suffered fearfully in the Punic Wars, in the expansionistic campaigns East and West, and in the Social War. Roman citizens had also followed the course of conquest, going into the Gracchan colonies or into provincial ventures of their own accord, when the plantation system had made life precarious at home. As we have noted, their places were taken by hordes of slaves who bred up a new race of freedom and consequently of citizens. Could these men, mostly of excitable eastern races, become true citizens of a Roman Republic? However keen of mind and shrewd of wit they were, their experience as slaves had taught them lessons of individual craftiness rather than of political wisdom. Of Rome's constitution, the *mos majorum*, they knew little and cared less. Those dominating traditions—that an autocrat should never establish a throne in Rome, that men willingly die for liberty, that Rome never acknowledged defeat—were to them meaningless. Whether they might have been Romanized in time, we cannot tell; we as yet know too little about the persistence of racial traits to speculate profitably, but it is very likely

¹¹ Ferrero, *Short History of Rome*, Vol. 2, p. 328, Putnams, 1919.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that there was a vital and ineradicable temperamental difference between the versatile, choleric, superstitious, mystical and servile Asiatic and the slow-minded, composed, rationalistic and liberty-loving Roman, and that the *mos majorum* created by centuries of Romans could neither be comprehended nor respected by the new stock which was taking the place of the old. It is not an accident that the civil war began with a demand that the freedmen be given the full franchise in all the wards. After Sulla's constitution was adopted future freedmen were again for a while confined to the four wards, but the masses that had been unloosed by Sulpicius and Cinna could not later be herded back, and the descendants of these men were henceforth in no way distinguishable from the sons of Roman citizens. In a word, it would seem that the worst disease of the Republic was the disease that devastated the race which had built the Republic and that made place for peoples who were by temperament incapable of republican government.¹²

Whether the cause was the fact that the newer peoples were by inheritance unfit for the government of the Empire and could not acquire the political habits of the old Romans, it is at least clear that they did not acquire them. They came in too fast to be assimilated.

A nation, then, is only formed when diverse races become unified. It would seem, on the other hand, that it may decay and die when its racial unity is lost.

4. THE MAKING OF AMERICA AND THE MELTING-POT'S CONTRIBUTION

Of course the experience of other nations cannot be applied rigidly to our America. For one thing,

¹² Frank, *A History of Rome*, p. 242, Henry Holt & Company, 1923.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

England and France were formed in the Middle Ages when communication was slow and difficult, when there was no printing press, few books, no newspapers, no telegraph or radio, and no railroads. On the other hand, the story sketched above has shown that they had advantages which we do not have. They could develop and grow to unity and a common consciousness undistracted by the divergent, disintegrating excitements of our modern world. Their peoples were more unified than ours is to-day, and far more unified than ours would have been if free immigration had continued. The ruling races in both England and France forged their nations by military power. They did not have to defer to the conflicting views of divergent groups whose suffrages they needed.

The analogies are not exact or even close, and yet surely the experiences of other nations should give us pause. But our buoyant optimism scorns the experience of other nations. Other nations may have had long and arduous travail in attaining unity, they may have lost their unity when inundated by strange peoples, but this is America and this is the twentieth century. So we are told that we can do what no other nation has been able to do in centuries, nay, what no other nation has tried to do. We are told that we can take, not three or four raw tribes with no conscious past and no deeply ingrained national habits, but people from twenty different nations, many of which have developed separately for a thousand

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

years in intense national units, each with its own language, highly developed customs and ancient traditions, and pour them into a country legally only one hundred and fifty years old of which only half the population traces back one hundred and thirty years, and yet make them magically one with us. For America is a new land, unspoiled. Old hatreds and habits dissolve in her favoring air. The Melting-Pot is the answer to all doubts.

Yet surely America has had her full share of turmoil and danger in obtaining and maintaining nationhood. Do we need to remind ourselves that the first settlement was made in 1607, that heavy immigration came as early as the decade between 1630 and 1640, and yet that it was not until 1776 that the colonists could think and act together? The men in the colonies held loyalty to their own colony ahead of loyalty to the thirteen. "For generations," says Channing, "the dwellers in each of the thirteen original colonies or states had regarded themselves as forming a distinct administrative entity; the planters of Virginia were Virginians, otherwise they were Englishmen."¹³ This stubborn localism handicapped Washington at every turn in the Revolution. Petty state jealousies dominated the Continental Congress, and prevented the country from giving more than a portion of its strength to the Revolutionary cause. In the days of the Confederation, the jealousies of the states ran riot and all but wrecked the new country. Channing continues, "The penurious

¹³ Channing, *History of the United States*, Vol. III, p. 431.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

condition of the members of the Confederation caused them to look with jealousy upon any one of their members that seemed to be prosperous and to endeavor to build up their own trade and fill their treasuries at the expense of their neighbors."¹⁴ The various states discriminated against the commerce of each other, and refused revenue and support to the central government. The Confederation all but broke asunder and it was only by the most determined efforts and the dire pressure of events that the really revolutionary Constitution was finally adopted.

Nor was the Union safe even then. It was a generation, perhaps two, before even the North began to think and act nationally. Certainly the Hartford Convention was a lightning flash indicating the separation of New England. Barrett Wendell suggests that Webster was the first national figure, the first great leader born after the Nation was founded who had no memory of the old colonial days. All through the forty years' period between 1820 and 1860 the struggle went on and the contest between separatism and nationalism was not really settled until Appomattox Court-House.

But the result has been so successful, our achievement has been so mighty, that many believe that we can scorn the experience of the past. They see no danger of losing our position. They do not fear the influx of foreign masses, because they believe that the melting-pot will work in the future as it has in the past. Indeed they believe that the melting-pot is

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 467.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the secret of our success. They believe that America has been a melting-pot from the beginning. Out of heterogeneity America came and with heterogeneity she will continue in her greatness. Their theory is vividly shown by their fondness of contrasting the United States of America with a suggested United States of Europe, and asking why, if we have effected a unity here, Europe cannot do it also. They have given this idea to foreign observers. An English member of the British Military Mission in Paris, Brigadier-General E. L. Spears, writing of the Inter-parliamentary Conference of 1925, said :

Perhaps the most important effect of the Washington Conference has been to show the European delegates how the American people, the descendants of all the European races, live at peace, as a single happy family speaking one language and obeying one law. The lesson has not been lost on the representatives of the Old World, where the shackles of tradition and the fetters of the past still bind the nations and keep them penned each within his own borders, suspicious and afraid. This immense country, where free trade flourishes from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Canadian border to Mexico, also conveys an economic lesson which will not be forgotten.¹⁵

Mr. J. L. Garvin, the editor of the *London Observer* and the new editor of the *Britannica*, writing a Fourth of July paper on America for the former magazine, spoke of the example of America's unity as contrasted to Europe's chaotic disunion.

Another political contrast is far more vital and puts a crucial

¹⁵ *New York Times*, October 25, 1925.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

question to the Old World. Union makes strength. On this side of the ocean, nothing but a United States of Europe could insure to the people forming it a general wealth and well-being fully equal to the prosperity of the United States of America.

That Republic, covering half a continent, surrounds itself by a tariff wall, but the territory inside that wall is larger than all Europe, including Russia, and throughout that region there is free trade between the States and an absolute assurance of peace. . . .

A United States of Europe with internal free trade and no wars could easily double and treble in one generation the present average level of prosperity. That is certain.

Otherwise Europeans must remain economic helots by comparison with America because of their plethora of antiquated passions or prejudices and their want of dominating brains. They make the bed they lie on.

Practically, the movement for a United States of Europe is the biggest idea of the twentieth century. If it succeeds in spite of a thousand obstacles, it will be the biggest thing of the century.¹⁰

We need not stop here to consider the question of nationalism, and whether Mr. Garvin does not confuse nationalism with the evils of nationalism. Whether the time is ripe, or whether it is even desirable for a vast international organization to take the place of our separate national states, whether it would lead to as much bickering inside the organization as now obtains between states, whether our loyalties and our habits are ready to lose the charm, the intimacy, the beauty of separate national lives, that is not the question here. The point is simply that

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, July 5, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

General Spears and Mr. Garvin have totally misconceived the American nation, its origin and its nature.

But we can understand an Englishman making this mistake when our own people make it constantly. Thus the *New York Times* declared editorially that the phrase "United States of Europe" is "one that comes easily to the lips of Americans who think in terms of their own boundaries at any rate." There were no physical obstacles to such union in Europe, it said, "The real obstacles that seem now almost insuperable are those that reside in the minds of men, their traditional attitudes, their national passions, their unreasoning antipathies, their inherited prides, their selfish hopes."¹⁷ And yet perhaps there is no nation in the world that clings more stubbornly, more savagely, one might almost say, to its ancestral separation. We are intensely prejudiced against other nations, we resent their power and their influence, we have carried our grudge against England for a hundred and fifty years, and to-day our talk is full of the bitterest jibes at the "Frogs" as debt defaulters and mean "franc squeezers." We have refused to join the League of Nations, we have loaded our consent to join the World Court with reservations, for several years we refused even to confer with representatives of other nations of the League, and yet we scorn the childish nationalism of Europe. As for the hatreds of Europe, let us merely say that if Germany, Austria and Bulgaria had bombed the cities of the Atlantic seaboard or the Middle West, I think there

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, April 1, 1923.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

would be a considerable portion of our population that would resent joining her in a United States of Europe or America. We should also recall that since 1815 there has been one general war in Europe, one lasting four years, while we had a terrible Civil War which also lasted four years and which in loss of men was almost as serious to North and South as the World War was to England and France and Germany.

But President Coolidge himself has expressed the same theory that America is an example to Europe. In his speech at the Norse Centennial in St. Paul on June 8, 1925, he said:

It is not so many years since visitors from other quarters of the world were wont to contemplate our concourse of races, origins and interests and shake their heads ominously. They feared that from such a melting pot of diverse elements we could never draw the tested, tempered metal that is the only substance for national character. Even among ourselves were many who listened with serious concern to such forebodings. They were not quite sure whether we had created a nation with the soul of a nation. They wondered if perhaps we had merely brought together a large number of people in a large place. Had these misgivings been justified when the hour of trial came it would have meant disaster to us and to the world.

But instead of crumbling into a chaos of discordant elements America proved its truly national unity. It demonstrated conclusively that there is a spiritual quality shared by all the races and conditions of men which is their universal heritage and common nature. Powerful enough to hold this people to a high ideal in time of supreme trial, why may we not hope that the same influence will at length reach men and women

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

wherever they are found on earth? If fraternity and coöperation are possible on the scale of this continent among people so widely diverse, why not on the scale of the world? It is not a new thought, but it is a profoundly engaging one. I firmly believe it is more than a chimera. I feel it is possible of realization. I am convinced that our national story might somewhat help to guide mankind toward such a goal. Therefore I urge the deeply thoughtful study and teaching of our history.¹⁸

Through all these statements runs the assumption that a United States of Europe is comparable to the United States of America. Now a United States of Europe may be a good thing. But our experience in the formation of this country gives no slightest hint of whether or not it would work, no slightest example of comparison. To be comparable to the United States of Europe it would be necessary that when we were formed, we were thirteen different nations, each with an old and a proud separate history, traditions, a law and language and literature of its own, inhabited each by a race different from the others, with century-old feuds and jealousies between us. To make any comparison hold, Massachusetts would have had to be English; Virginia, French; North Carolina, Austrian; South Carolina, Czecho-Slovakian; Georgia, Yugoslavic; Maryland, Roumanian; New York, German; Pennsylvania, Russian; Connecticut, Norwegian; Rhode Island, Swedish; Delaware, Swiss; New Jersey, Italian, and New Hampshire, Greek. And then we would leave out Spain, Denmark, Hol-

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1925.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

land, Belgium, Bulgaria, Albania, Poland and the new Russian states.

It is needless to say that America was not formed in this way. Her colonies all belonged to England in 1775 and all spoke the same language, all had the same legal system, all, or practically all, had the same governmental system. We were not formed of thirteen different nations.

Moreover, as we have seen, it was not even a case where diverse nationalities in about equal proportions composed the population of thirteen colonies, which then formed one nation. The United States at its start was not made up in population of one-thirteenth Germans, one-thirteenth Austrians, one-thirteenth English, one-thirteenth Italians, and so on. Ninety percent of us were English, Scotch and Scotch-Irish. We were a remarkably homogeneous race.

In a real sense, our American nation began one thousand years before 1776 in the hundred motes of Anglo-Saxon England. Ninety percent of us in 1790 originated in a country with a developed law, language and political institutions and with a racial unity and like-mindedness binding us together.

It is a striking fact, however, that the colonies where the population was most diverse were the least coherent politically and the slowest in developing.

The only colonies which could be said to be melting-pot colonies in anything approaching the degree which we see exemplified to-day in our eastern states were New York, New Jersey, Delaware and Penn-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

sylvania. New York had 16.1% Dutch to 78.2% English and 3.2% Scotch; Delaware had 86.3% English, 7.5% Scotch, 3.9% Irish and 1% Dutch; New Jersey is estimated to have had 12.7% Dutch, 9.2% German, 7.1% Irish, 58% English and 7.7% Scotch; Pennsylvania is given 59% English, 11.7% Scotch, and 26.1% German.¹⁹ To-day such states would be considered remarkably homogeneous.

Sydney G. Fisher in his *The Quaker Colonies* refers to the diverse character of the peoples that made up Pennsylvania—first the English, then the Welsh, then the Germans and the Scotch-Irish. "Nearly all these diverse elements of the Pennsylvania population," he says, "were decidedly sectional in character. The Welsh had a language of their own, and they attempted, though without success, to maintain it, as well as a government of their own within their barony independent of the regular government of the Province.

"The Germans were also extremely sectional. They clung with better success to their own language, customs and literature. The Scotch-Irish were so clannish that they had ideas of forming a separate province on the Susquehanna."²⁰

The coming of the Scotch-Irish to Pennsylvania and the other colonies and the Germans to Pennsylvania was much resented by the older settlers, and much discord and even bloodshed resulted. The Scotch-Irish in Pennsylvania were very turbulent,

¹⁹ *A Century of Population Growth*, pp. 117, 121.

²⁰ Fisher, *The Quaker Colonies*, p. 51, Yale University Press.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

and often fought bitterly with the Germans who called them the "accursed Irish." Lodge notes that the quarrels were carried into the Pennsylvania Assembly, and "divided the legislature into two parties—on one side the Quakers and the Germans, and on the other the rest of the English and the Irish [namely the Scotch-Irish] who succeeded usually in obtaining the upper hand."²¹ The Scotch-Irish long continued their separate activity and in fact the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794 is often called the Scotch-Irish Rebellion.

Franklin wrote in 1751 to a friend in England asking why the Pennsylvanians should allow the Palatine Germans "to swarm into our Settlements, and by herding together to establish their Language and Manners to the exclusion of ours? Why should Pennsylvania founded by the English become a colony of Aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them, and will never adopt our Language or Customs any more than they can acquire our Complexions?"²² Again he complained that, "This will in a few years become a German colony. Instead of their learning our Language, we must learn theirs or live in a foreign country. Already, the English begin to quit particular neighborhoods surrounded by Dutch [Germans] being made uneasy by the Disagreeableness of dissonant manners; and in time will probably quit the

²¹ Lodge, *A Short History of the English Colonies in America*, p. 248, Harper & Bros.

²² A. H. Smith, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, The Macmillan Company, 1905.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Province for the same Reason. Besides the Dutch [Germans] underlive and are thereby enabled to underwork and undersell the English; who are thereby extreamly incommoded, and consequently disgusted so that there can be no cordial affection or unity between the two nations.”²³ Again he wrote two years later, “Few of their children in the country learn English. They import many Books from Germany; and of the six Printing-Houses in the Province, two are entirely German, two half German, and half English, and but two entirely English. They have one German newspaper, and one half German. Advertisements, intended to be general are now printed in Dutch and English. The Signs on our Streets have inscriptions in both Languages, and in some places only German. They begin of late to make all their Bonds and other legal Instruments in their own Language, which (though I think it ought not to be) are allowed in our Courts where the German business so increases, that there is continued need of Interpreters; and I suppose, in a few years, they will also be necessary in the Assembly to tell one half of our Legislators what the other half say.

“In short, unless the Stream of their Importation could be turned from this to other colonies, as you very judiciously propose, they will so soon outnumber us, that all the advantages we have, will not in my Opinion be able to preserve our Language, and even our Government will become precarious.”²⁴

How modern all this sounds! The individuals

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

may be, in the case of the Pennsylvania Germans they were, admirable additions but the racial group living together makes for weakness and disunion. Franklin objected to the Germans as a racial group. He said that he was "not entirely for refusing to admit them into our Colonies; all that seems to me necessary is to distribute them more equally, mix them with the English," in short give them a chance to be individual colonists and not members of a racial group. He praised their industry and frugality which he said were "exemplary." He said that, "They are excellent Husbandmen; and contribute greatly to the Improvement of a Country."²⁵

Let it not be said that time has proved that Franklin's fears were groundless. Pennsylvania has paid for her heterogeneity. We have seen that she had open discord in the beginning. But her heterogeneity has continued to weaken her. It prevented her acting her full part in the Colonial Wars and in the Revolution. Franklin himself noted in 1753 that "in the last war the Germans refused to engage in it, giving out, one amongst another and even in Print that if they were quiet, the French, should they take the country, would not molest them; at the same time abusing the Philadelphians for fitting out Privateers against the enemy and representing the trouble, Hazard and Expense of defending the Province, as a greater Inconvenience than any that might be expected from a change of government."²⁶ Pennsylvania's racial diversity also hampered her in the

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Revolution. Van Tyne notes that Pennsylvania held back more than any other colony and had to be dragged in by Massachusetts.²⁷ Fisher concludes, "All these cleavages and divisions in the population continue in their effects to this day. They prevented the formation of a homogeneous population."²⁸ To this day, the Pennsylvania Germans are a distinct separate element in Pennsylvania, though in the country at large, their descendants are indistinguishable.

If all the colonies had been as heterogeneous as Pennsylvania there would certainly have been no new nation in 1776. The nation was ready to be created because as a whole we were homogeneous, remarkably so. The nation was not made out of a melting-pot. It was no accident that the colonies which were the most homogeneous, those of New England and Virginia, were at all times the leaders. They dominated the Revolution. The New England tradition has made the Middle West and done much to mold the entire nation. The Virginia tradition has dominated the South. The homogeneous colonies had a unified tradition, a common life. They had no racial dissensions. They were united and they led the way. And indeed the country as a whole had no internal racial conflicts to delay its progress.

Our essential homogeneity continued until 1860. There are no figures of immigration prior to 1820, but as immigration in 1820 was only 8,300 we can be

²⁷ Van Tyne, *The American Revolution*, p. 74, Harper & Bros., 1905.

²⁸ Fisher, *The Quaker Colonies*, p. 52.

THE MAKING OF NATIONS

sure that immigration prior to that date was light. Moreover, it was largely from Great Britain. About 1844, after the Irish potato famine, heavy immigration began from south Ireland, and after 1848 from Germany. This was the first heavy non-British immigration. In 1850-1860 the total immigration was 2,598,214, in 1861-1870 it was 2,314,824, and in 1871-1880 it was 2,812,191. Most of this immigration was from Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Germany and Ireland. Huge masses came from the last four countries. It was the first really different immigration.

But it is clear that up to at least 1850 our population increased largely unaffected by immigration. In 1850, 82.4% of our white population was still of the 1790 stock. Nor even as the large diverse immigration from Germany, Ireland, Sweden and Norway came in, did the situation change. The immigrants did not come to different nations. They came to settled, homogeneous communities. In Wisconsin, it is true, so many Germans came that it was once even proposed that Wisconsin become a German state of the Union, but although the proportion of Germans was large, it was never controlling, and of course the project, fatal as it would have been to the American nation, never got beyond speculation. The immigrants fell, then, sometimes individually, sometimes as groups, into the settled American commonwealth. As long as their numbers were small they did not affect its structure or nature. To the extent that they came in groups, and remained groups, they have always caused us concern, and it is the purpose of this

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

book to show that they threatened and still threaten our unity. In short, to the extent that our immigration has even slightly approximated the conditions of Europe, it is the belief of millions of us that it has injured us and is now a direct threat to our safety. The United States of America is the antithesis of the hoped-for United States of Europe. Our success in the past, when in the beginning 90% of our population had common traditions, is no criterion of our success when only 50% traces to as far back as 1790, and much less of the year 2000 if no stock is over 15% or 20% of our total population.

Already there are signs that we are going on our momentum, the momentum gained in the time when we were homogeneous, that we remain a nation now when we are only fifty percent homogeneous, because we once were and long had been ninety percent homogeneous.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT— THE TEST OF THE WAR

I. THE GROWTH OF ALIEN GROUPS

IN THE very beginning of the discussion of the action of alien groups in American politics, I wish to explain as emphatically as possible that the discussion, and any criticisms which may be contained in it, apply only to those of recent or earlier alien origin who have remained in racial groups and who think and act with an alien bias, who try to work our politics to aid their native countries. It does not apply to the great number of those of alien origin who have not remained in racial groups and do not think with an alien bias but have become individual Americans of German, Irish, Norwegian or other descent, as the case may be. In short, the discussion is concerned with what has popularly become known to be hyphenated Americans and not Americans of alien origin. The latter are in no way referred to in the chapters which follow, but the record itself will speak to show that there are great numbers of aliens and those of alien origin who have remained in racial groups, who think and act with an alien bias and cause confusion and turmoil in our politics. These I will refer to as German-Americans or pro-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

book to show that they threatened and still threaten our unity. In short, to the extent that our immigration has even slightly approximated the conditions of Europe, it is the belief of millions of us that it has injured us and is now a direct threat to our safety. The United States of America is the antithesis of the hoped-for United States of Europe. Our success in the past, when in the beginning 90% of our population had common traditions, is no criterion of our success when only 50% traces to as far back as 1790, and much less of the year 2000 if no stock is over 15% or 20% of our total population.

Already there are signs that we are going on our momentum, the momentum gained in the time when we were homogeneous, that we remain a nation now when we are only fifty percent homogeneous, because we once were and long had been ninety percent homogeneous.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT— THE TEST OF THE WAR

I. THE GROWTH OF ALIEN GROUPS

IN THE very beginning of the discussion of the action of alien groups in American politics, I wish to explain as emphatically as possible that the discussion, and any criticisms which may be contained in it, apply only to those of recent or earlier alien origin who have remained in racial groups and who think and act with an alien bias, who try to work our politics to aid their native countries. It does not apply to the great number of those of alien origin who have not remained in racial groups and do not think with an alien bias but have become individual Americans of German, Irish, Norwegian or other descent, as the case may be. In short, the discussion is concerned with what has popularly become known to be hyphenated Americans and not Americans of alien origin. The latter are in no way referred to in the chapters which follow, but the record itself will speak to show that there are great numbers of aliens and those of alien origin who have remained in racial groups, who think and act with an alien bias and cause confusion and turmoil in our politics. These I will refer to as German-Americans or pro-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Germans, Irish-Americans or Sinn Feiners or other hyphenated groups, rather than as Americans of German or Irish or other descent.

It is customary even to-day to scoff at the fear of alien groups and to say that their power is negligible. The faith in the Melting-Pot still survives.

In view of the fact that after almost 200 years the Pennsylvania Germans are still a separate racial group in Pennsylvania, and that after 124 years the French in Louisiana are still so separate and distinct that even the negroes in the French sections talk French, this faith in the power of the Melting-Pot to dissolve racial groups has always been difficult to understand. But it is no less than amazing that our native optimism in the magical power of the Melting-Pot should have survived the war. For the war disclosed large groups, many of them of long residence in this country, which showed a complete failure to understand our institutions or to think with an American background. These groups had long lived a social life apart from the rest of Americans. The Germans by their different language and traditions tended early to separate into separate groups. In Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville they long had maintained rich and powerful German clubs. The atmosphere in them was often delightful, particularly to those of us who find something drab in our Anglo-Saxon ways of life. The German-Americans liked social life, they came to their clubs in the evenings to eat and drink their beer, they liked singing and fostered choral societies

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

and encouraged opera and public saenger-fests. But they spoke German very largely at their clubs and even in their homes. They fostered a love of the Fatherland, which in itself was natural and even commendable, but they also emphasized their own differences from the native Americans and rejoiced in them. A college friend of mine whose grandparents on both sides emigrated to this country, told me that not only at the German club but at the family dinner table only German was spoken, and the native stock was habitually referred to as "Die Amerikaner" and the speakers as "Unser Deutsch" commonly to the disparagement of "Die Amerikaner."

The Irish, the second large diverse group, were held together partly by their religion which requires marriage inside the Church, and partly by their ancestral clannishness engendered and emphasized by their centuries-old opposition to the British. As consequence, the Irish have to a great extent remained a unique and active separate group. In our large cities the Irish have acted largely as political units. I recall how in a bitter Boston election some seventeen years ago a young Harvard man of Irish extraction was asked by an old friend in his native ward how he was going to vote. He was disgusted with the administration of the Irish mayor running for re-election and told his friend that he would vote against the mayor. "Oh, yes," said his friend, "now that you have gone to college you have gone back on your own people."

The Irish-Americans have carried their antipathy

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

against England into American politics. Next to the school histories, their influence has been most potent in keeping the Revolutionary War animosity alive. They have opposed every policy involving co-operation with England irrespective of the benefit to America. In 1866 and again in 1870 and again in 1871, American-Irish made Fenian attacks on Canada.

The Swedes likewise, particularly in Minnesota and the Dakotas, became race-conscious, separate groups. The same thing has happened with the newer immigrants from southern Europe.

The very differences between the immigrants, their different languages and customs, tended to cause them to marry within the group and to perpetuate the group.

Early we began to have alien group votes. It became the custom to cater to the Irish vote, the German vote, and the Swedish vote. No county ticket was thought scientific that did not represent the various racial elements. It was a standing joke to ask why Jones or Smith was on the county ticket and to receive the reply that one lone candidate was necessary to represent the American vote. Only last fall, the Boston *Herald* said that, "The most disturbing aspect of the present Republican campaign [in Massachusetts] is the lack of anything like racial or geographical balance in the ticket. The entire seven names on the general ticket, are of the same racial group, and are legal residents of Greater Boston."¹

¹Quoted *New York Times* Editorial, October 26, 1926.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Vice-President Marshall in his *Hoosier Salad*, speaking of political days in Indiana a generation ago, humorously admitted:

We liked fondly to refer to the German-American, the Irish-American and the Franco-American. We made our appeal politically to them as though they had one foot on their native soil, and the other upon the soil of Indiana. We did not even stop with the question of blood. We catered, as it paid, to Protestant and Catholic views. We were very liberal with the Catholic vote where it was the predominating element in the election, and were very censorious of it if it did not happen to be for our party.²

The catering to alien group votes of course went beyond the selection of foreign-born candidates. It affected the nomination of native-born candidates who did not bow to the alien vote, and to the rejection of policies which they did not like. Very early the German vote had to be considered on anything that affected the liquor interests. James Ford Rhodes notes that General Scott was attacked as early as 1852 for his views on immigration. "Accused of Nativism," he declares, "the basis of the charge was a letter more than ten years old to the American Party men of Philadelphia. 'I now hesitate,' the general had written, 'between extending the period of residence before naturalization and a total repeal of all acts of Congress on the subject; my mind inclines to the latter.' The large Irish and German immigration of the past few years had given the foreign vote

² *New York Times*, September 20, 1925 (I doubt if he meant Franco-American for I never heard of any in Indiana).

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

an importance never before attached to it, and this is the first presidential campaign in which we light upon those now familiar efforts to cajole the German and Irish citizens."³

Again Rhodes notes that Senator Hoar wrote of the campaign of 1872: "I thought at the time that if Mr. Adams had been nominated, he might have been chosen." "Except in one respect," Rhodes adds, "he was an invulnerable candidate; it was said that he would lose a portion of the Irish vote."⁴

This habit of catering to foreign group votes is so prevalent in our politics, that I think a little general explanation of why our political system lends itself to the practice, and why it is so prevalent, would be helpful.

The long ticket and the separation of powers lays a heavy task on the party organization. In President Hadley's phrase, they have made of our political parties great brokerage, not of ideas but of offices. A long party ticket must be nominated. A large number of candidates are eager for election. In order to get any order out of government, all must be elected as confusion results if half of those elected to administrative positions are of one party and half of another. It is not enough to elect a Congressman or a Senator. The Senator is merely the head of the state ticket. But he is by no means the whole ticket; indeed, frequently a party organization has "knifed"

³ Rhodes, *History of the United States*, Vol. I, p. 272, The Macmillan Company.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 438.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

the head of the ticket and has remained perfectly content if it could place in office its local ticket. As a consequence, the head of the ticket, who needs the support of the entire organization, which also wants to get elected, pays great deference to the county candidates. He dare not offend them. They have their standards of what is politically safe, and defying a racial group is never one of them. As another consequence, the party habitually defers to the organized group. This is why it has always deferred to the labor vote, to the saloon vote, a temperance vote, an Irish vote, a German vote. The politician wants to elect his whole ticket. He does not want to alienate a single element.

The tremendous party task, therefore, has made the party fearful as a March hare. The leaders must defer to the least courageous man on the ticket. The party courage and intelligence are measured by the courage and intelligence of the candidate on the margin of production of its courage and intelligence. This theory meets the approval of more than the professional politician. A professional man of the highest standing at that time with no political connections and no known political aspirations said to me in 1916, that a candidate for the United States Senate had no right to declare himself on the German issue. He must think of the rest of the ticket.

Perhaps the pet fear of the politician is the fear of the alien group vote. During and since the war we have had ample proof of this statement which will be detailed in these pages. The alien group vote, once

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

almost a joke with us, has become an object of terror, distorting thought and action both.

2. THE GERMAN-AMERICANS AND THE WAR

This natural and instinctive love of the German-Americans for their Fatherland was fostered through long-continued, organized efforts into an active and powerful political force. The chief instrument was the German-American Alliance. One of the main objects of this organization was, in its own words, "to foster the feeling of unity in the element of German origin of the United States." What this meant is well indicated by the third declared object of the association, "to oppose nativistic influences."⁵ Mr. Gustavus Ohlinger, as his name indicates, himself of German descent, declares that a report of this society stated: "Our own prestige depends upon the prestige of the Fatherland and for that reason we cannot allow any disparagement of Germany to go unpunished."⁶

"As German-Americans," declared the President of the Alliance at its 1911 convention, "we are a people that can look back upon a glorious past and can look forward with confidence to a no less glorious future. As Americans, on the other hand, we are merely an unknown quantity in the great racial jumble of this land. Let us, therefore, with united energies, and with every available means, battle for the

⁵ Pamphlet, National German American Alliance, Philadelphia, 1915.

⁶ Ohlinger, *Their True Faith and Allegiance*, p. 43, The Macmillan Company, 1916.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

preservation of our racial character and of its intellectual achievements." "We are proud to call ourselves citizens of this Republic," said the President of the Wisconsin Federation recently, "but we are still prouder to be German-Americans."⁷

The president of the Alliance said to an audience of 10,000 in Milwaukee: "We have before us a bitter struggle and we can wage it successfully only if we are united—a united race of brothers. We have long suffered the preachment that 'you Germans must allow yourselves to be assimilated, you must merge in the American people' but no one will ever find us prepared to descend to an inferior culture."⁸

This organized German influence persistently resisted "nativistic influences," it brought about the teaching of German in the public schools and it maintained a large and even wealthy German-American press.

The story could be continued at great length but there is no need. Suffice it to say that in 1914 there was, particularly in the large cities where the German-Americans lived as groups, a large German-American population, often speaking German, reading German newspapers, hearing German propaganda, and with distinctly German prejudices.

With the beginning of the war in 1914, the German influence began to organize. In the first week of the war there was a strong anti-German tinge in the news. The entry into Belgium was an event which struck at the roots of our political opinion.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

The German-Americans were amazed at the bitterness of the outbreak against the ruling German powers, a bitterness which popularly centered itself on the Kaiser. But the German-Americans soon got their wind. They made their power felt immediately. In one large Middle Western city a group of prominent pro-German business men waited on the editors of the two chief papers and served notice that they must be neutral. They were not to take sides. The threat was clear, though perhaps not expressly stated. Advertising would be withdrawn if a policy not unfavorable to Germany was not maintained. In Louisville, the redoubtable Colonel Waterson refused to be cowed. He was told that he would be put out of business. It was then that he replied with his ringing editorial ending: "To hell with the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg," in which he dared the German-Americans to put him out of business and declared that he would rather be free and bankrupt than cowed and safe.

It was not long until the German-Americans, assisted by Irish-Americans, began to hold great mass meetings called neutrality meetings at which German and Irish orators denounced the policy of the administration towards the British blockade, called on the administration to enforce our rights by force against England, and demanded what they called strict neutrality, including an embargo on arms and munitions shipped to the Allies.

There is no need to repeat here the long story of the organization through German sources of so-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

called neutrality organizations, usually financed by the German government, called the American Industrial Union, the American Embargo Conference, the National Labor Peace Council, the Friends of Peace, the American Truth Society. Their objects were all much the same—to spread sympathy for the German cause, to breed hatred for the Allies, and specifically to favor an embargo on munitions and supplies to the Allies and the warning of Americans off of armed ships. The story of the attempts to corrupt American labor, to influence our press and coerce our politicians is too recent to require repetition. Samuel Gompers openly charged that emissaries of the Friends of Peace used bribery to foment strikes; Germans were warned against employment in munition factories, and boycotts against munition factories were attempted.

The German-American Alliance, in the words of the report of the Senate Subcommittee on the Judiciary, which reported in 1919 on German and Bolshevik propaganda, "became particularly active in its efforts to bring all citizens and residents of the United States of German extraction together and to work publicly and privately for the aims of Germany."⁹ The Senate report quotes a declaration made by the chairman of its propaganda committee in January 1916, declaring that the leaders and lecturers of the Alliance "have, since the establishment of this organization, never failed to emphasize the

⁹ Brewing and Liquor Interests and German and Bolshevik Propaganda, Sen. Doc. 61, 66th Congress, 1st Session, p. 5.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

fact that the greatness, the strength, and the influence of Germanism in this country lies in appreciation of itself, in the recognition of an inviolable union of ideals which knows no limits, but only progress and upward aspiration, a union whose activity lies in the United States, protecting German style and manner and strengthening them."¹⁰ The propaganda committee therefore urged that with the beginning of the year "all German-Americans, forgetting all separate interests, build, operate, and exercise their creative ability on the rock of true, inviolable union, on which all German life rests, on which all the higher ideals of the Germans can securely rest."¹¹ The Senate Subcommittee's report specifies in great detail the activities of the German organizations in the United States and of the German government in financing, aiding and directing activities in this country to aid the German cause. The committee, for example, estimated that "at least \$35,000,000 was raised and expended by the German Government in the United States for various purposes during the period from August, 1914, to February, 1917."¹² It stated that Labor's National Peace Council was financed by the German government, and that a convention in July, 1915, for the purpose of urging the President to declare an embargo upon the sale of munitions to the Allies was financed by the German government to the extent of \$500,000. It showed that a press bureau was maintained which sent out articles both to German and English language news-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

papers. A newspaper in New York was purchased by the German government for the purpose of advocating the German cause. An Irish press and news service was also maintained, and likewise an organized Jewish propaganda was conducted. The League of American Women advocating strict neutrality received money from the German fund, and numerous societies labeled American also received financial aid and support.¹³

A large section of the press worked ceaselessly in the German cause. Every possible emotional appeal was made to the German population.

The result was inevitable. Large numbers of the German population of German origin fused like molten matter under the heat of this agitation. I personally know men who at the beginning of the war were lukewarm to Germany or convinced that she was in the wrong, who half a year later under the influence of German group opinion were at white heat at any aspersion on the justice of her cause. One man of socialistic tendencies returned from Germany in August, 1914, and before he was swept into the local group opinion gave out an interview in which he said that Germany clearly was responsible for the war. It was not long after he reached his local club until he retracted the interview.

The pro-Germans soon began to operate upon native opinion. Naïvely enough, while they were intensely pro-German themselves, they insisted that their friends, the native Americans, remain neutral.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-16.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

One lawyer in a Middle Western city was courageous and outspoken in attacking the German cause. He was the first man in that city publicly to do so. Many of his clients had been German-Americans. They fell away. Efforts were made with general success to turn other clients from him. Even social ostracism was attempted. Partly in deference to outright threats, partly to avoid friction and not to offend the feelings of old clients, customers and friends, public discussion of the war was in general taboo in centers where the German element was large.

During all of 1915 and 1916 the terror of the Pro-German and the anti-English vote controlled or influenced our political action. It led to partial or discriminatory action, much of it harmless except as it betrayed a petty, partial and timid spirit. Congress passed a resolution setting aside a day for the expression of sympathy for the Jews of Europe. No day was set apart for the Serbians and the Belgians. There was a Jewish vote, there was no Belgian vote and the Serbian vote was negligible compared with the German vote. Congress asked clemency for Roger Casement. It did not ask clemency or express sympathy for Edith Cavell or Captain Fryatt. Our government protested against outrages in Armenia. Theodore Roosevelt was asked to join in a mass-meeting in behalf of the Armenians. In a ringing and memorable letter he declined.

One reason [he said,] why I do not wish to take part in a mass meeting only for the denunciation of the atrocities com-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

mitted on the Armenians is because there are ignoble souls who have preached professional pacifism as a creed, or who have refused to attend similar meetings on behalf of the Belgians, who yet do not take such action on behalf of the Armenians—for the simple reason that there is in America no Turkish vote.¹⁴

In the Chicago mayoralty campaign of 1915 a circular distributed in behalf of Robert M. Sweitzer, the Democratic candidate, actually declared:

Chicago has a larger German population than any city in the world, excepting Berlin and Vienna; and the German-, Austrian-, and Hungarian-Americans should, at this coming election, *set aside every other consideration*, and vote as a unit for Robert M. Sweitzer. Stand shoulder to shoulder in this election, as our countrymen in the trenches and on the high seas are fighting for the preservation of our dear Fatherland. The election of a German-American would be a fitting answer to the defamers of the Fatherland, would cause a tremendous moral effect throughout the United States, and would reëcho in Germany, Austria and Hungary.

A direct appeal in an American election to vote for the Fatherland.¹⁵

But the most pernicious activity of the pro-Germans was in Congress itself. One would naturally think that the instinct of any Senator or Congressman would be to denounce any foreign power which sank our ships, or killed our people. On the contrary, Congressman after Congressman seized the

¹⁴ Roosevelt, *Fear God and Take Your Own Part*, p. 377, George H. Doran Company, 1916.

¹⁵ Quoted in *Counter-Currents*, p. 211, Agnes Repplier, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

occasion to denounce and insult the Americans who were killed and abused them in terms so shameful that it makes one wince to read them even to-day.

"An American citizen," said a Representative, "who in the face of the terrible cataclysm now engulfing half the civilized world, persists in traveling for pleasure or profit in the danger zone, and in a belligerent ship, shows that he is utterly lacking in patriotism, and wholly regardless of the rights of humanity. He is entitled to no consideration whatever, and for this country to become embroiled in this trouble on his account, would be a colossal blunder against humanity."¹⁶

A Congressman from Colorado said: "If I had the power I would tell Congress to stop talking about war and I would tell the traveling people to stay at home, but if they must go abroad, to travel on ships that bear our flag and I would let them know, if they did not honor my request and met with an accident or got killed, I would pay no attention to the incident."¹⁷

A southwestern Senator said: "I think any wayfarer, any madcap American citizen, may boast that¹⁸ as an inalienable or rather, I should say as an ancient right, vouchsafed him by international law. . . . Of course the right of one hundred millions to be protected against becoming involved in this butchery is not to be weighed in the balance with the sacred, the inherited right of a single irresponsible

¹⁶ Congressional Record, Vol. 53, p. 582.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3548.

¹⁸ Namely, the right to sail the seas.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

adventurer to imperil his own life, to throw away his own life, and to cause the sacrifice of millions of his fellow citizens, together with millions of their treasure.”¹⁹

Another Senator spoke of the “reckless bravado” of those Americans who dared to sail the seas in 1915 and 1916.²⁰

A Middle Western Senator declared: “I have said and I repeat that I favored such official warning, principally for the protection of the thoughtless and weak-minded who might not appreciate the danger, and to the end that a hundred million of peaceful and peace-loving people might not be plunged into war as the price of the stupendous folly of a handful of travelers. I had no thought for the personal safety of intelligent men, who out of a spirit of bravado, or foolhardiness or to promote their own selfish interests, would risk their lives on such vessels, for in my judgment such a man with such a treasonable bent of mind as to be indifferent to the danger of involving his country in war, and wrecking the happiness of hundreds of thousands of America’s homes has a life so worthless to this country as to be scarcely worth saving.”

A Congressman declared that he “would not be willing to risk the lives of those who have to fight the wars of this country to avenge the death of such a contemptible fool” as one who would travel on a ship of the Allies.

Another Congressman said: “Now none but moral

¹⁹ Congressional Record, p. 3908.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4020.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

cowards, thoughtless persons, or scheming speculators willing to take the risk for big profits, will travel on those ships. No American worthy of the name will, by any unnecessary act, jeopardize the welfare of 100,000,000 fellow Americans."

A Congressman from Wisconsin, a state with a large population of German origin, declared that these much-abused travelers were "highly unpatriotic, reckless, thrill-loving unpatriotic American citizens."

Another Congressman called them "foolhardy Americans recklessly and wickedly traveling on armed ships instead of unarmed ships."

A Congressman of Illinois declared: "I hope that our citizens may be so advised that we shall never be put to the test whether we have to fight because some fool had entered upon a joy-ride, or a voyage."

A Congressman from the West added his word of denunciation: "And now because some American wants a thrill, because some money spender, some blasé, foolhardy citizen wants to do something to spur his jaded appetite, we have another standard, a second standard of national honor; a standard that possibly might bring us into war, because of some wilfully foolish act of some reckless American citizen."

A Congressman from Massachusetts said that he was opposed to the resolution warning Americans off armed ships, but added: "I want to see the President of the United States take some action which would prevent foolhardy or fortune-seeking Americans en-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

dangering the peace, the happiness, the homes and the lives of 100,000,000 of their fellow countrymen."

A Congressman from Georgia said: "I do not believe in the bottom of the hearts of the members that they would be willing to declare war on Germany solely for sinking an armed merchantman of Italy or England on which is carried some American fool or idiot traveling for pleasure or profit, some fool or idiot or unpatriotic rascal."

Another Congressman said: "But such a resolution gives some sound advice to those people who are so unmistakably wicked, or so abysmally foolish as wantonly to jeopardize the peace and welfare of their hundred million of fellow citizens by the exercise of a technical right." ²¹

A Congressman from New Jersey asked: "Why should we permit a few foolhardy Americans, who are either reckless of their own safety, or perhaps procured and paid to protect a cargo of munitions of war to bring down upon America all the multiplied misery and havoc which attaches to modern warfare? Is not the protection of the very flower of our manhood and the welfare of our women and children and our aged of more consequence than the guaranteeing of protection to a fool in his folly?" ²²

Finally, let me quote from a Congressman's comment on the great speech of Josiah Royce in Tremont Temple in Boston on February 2, 1916. To any one who knew the unworldly, ascetic genius, the Congressman's speech was both silly and tragic in its

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4449.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 4488.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

complete failure to understand the noble and courageous idealism of the man, who, unable longer to endure our inaction, spoke at last magnificently with the voice of the old America. But here is what the Congressman said: "These words [of Royce] are portentous. They show to us men in Congress that the irresistible influence of Morgan's millions, and the subtle sentiment it is creating, seeks to embroil us in a governmental conflict with Germany and provoke war." He referred to the gentle Royce as "this high-collared, high-browed, high-toned, Tory Anglophobist [sic]" as "reprehensible, direful and damnable," and said he and those like him should be dealt with as "conspirators and treasonable traitors."²³

I have not spared the reader in this rather monotonous quotation of comments, all too dully alike in their tone and all too hopelessly cruel and cheap in their thought. It is very sad and discouraging reading. They are so alike, however, that it is evident that the opinion expressed by them was not unique. They must necessarily have been widely held. But I venture to think that it may be good for us in our moments of national self-complacency to realize how puerile and ignoble much of the opinion of our politicians was ten years ago.

Much of this opinion was merely crude, provincial and unworthy. It was that of men of limited experience who could not see why, when they had never been to Europe at all, anybody had to go in time of danger. If all that was needed to preserve peace

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 4593.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

was to stay at home, then why, for heaven's sake, not stay at home? The theory is understandable and it was widely held. But all cowardice is understandable, and this attitude was surely cowardly. The theory simply advised America to forego its rights in time of danger. But rights are never threatened save in time of danger, and they are no rights at all if in a crisis they fail. The tiresome iteration of the charge that the "adventurers" were all idle rich degenerates was of a piece with the old demagogic dogma, not so widely held to-day, that the rich are all undesirables. The theory that the rich are "milk-sops" does not hold well with the charge that they were all recklessly daring. But to call the roll of the *Lusitania's* dead is enough to destroy the brutal and mean-spirited slurs of these speeches. They were not blasé or foolhardy, and many of them were distinguished. Many of them were going on business many on errands of mercy. I had two college classmates who were killed on that ship. One was on his way to join Hoover's Belgian Relief Commission, the other on a confidential scientific mission. Neither was rich, blasé or foolhardy. Those killed on other boats were sometimes business men, sometimes American sailors, some were women, some were children. I wonder if every man who is now alive who spoke the ignoble words I have quoted, does not bitterly regret them.

Partly, these stereotyped insults of the dead were the snarlings of men who in their hearts were ill at ease, but who so dreaded a war with Germany that

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

they heaped abuse, not on Germany but on every one whom Germany injured.

But the main cause of the campaign of standardized abuse was the pro-German group vote. The assertion may jar on our sensibilities but I think it can be amply proved. The very force of pro-German group opinion, together with the President's neutrality speech, operated to stifle normal opinion. The very ignorance and narrowness displayed by their comments were directly due to lack of free discussion and largely to the deadly power of a foreign group opinion. Moreover, it was a striking fact that the Senators and Congressmen were gentle to Germany. Huston of Wisconsin, Gardner of Massachusetts, and Williams of Mississippi were the only outstanding men who ever dared to attack Germany. As clearer proof still, it is noteworthy that while these men were kind to Germany, they frequently attacked England. Finally, some of them naïvely asserted that a large percentage of their constituents were German by origin, frankly giving the whole situation away.

Thus one Senator, who had no criticism of Germany, violently attacked Morgan and the "depraved, damnable conduct of this English Empire."

A New York Congressman declared that there was more danger to be feared from England than from Germany. Another said, "We have been worse treated by England than by Germany."

A Congressman from Wisconsin said: "I believe that the American people would fight quicker on

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

account of the outrages perpetrated in seizing our merchant vessels bound for neutral ports, carrying non-contraband goods, and rifling United States mail, than they would go to war because a citizen of the United States insisted upon traveling on an armed merchantman of one of the countries at war, and lost his life by reason of his recklessness."

A Senator said: "There is nothing in the conduct of Germany in the past or in the present to warrant the opinion that she desires or will desire trouble with us. We have treated her in a most harsh and arbitrary way. She has not insulted us." ²⁴

Another Senator said: "How much better it would look, how much more appropriate the exhibition, if he [the President] would instruct the Secretary of State to serve notice upon England, that he would hold her to a strict accountability for her repeated violations of international law resulting in damage to American commerce and in insult to and outrage upon the rights of American citizens. . . . This Congress should by resolution, if need be, request the President of the United States to tell us why England treats us with the contempt of ignoring completely our notes of ministerial protest, and why she refuses absolutely to give any satisfaction for insults to our citizens, destruction of our commerce, and outrages upon the international mail service." ²⁵

In 1916 a Senator from a Middle Western state was handed two statements. One was from twenty-one German-Americans, and we will admit that they

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 6875.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4209.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

were prominent men. One was signed by 181 Americans, men certainly of at least equal prominence, as able and representative men as could be found in the city. The 181 protested against German aggressions. The Senator without a word presented the petition of the 181. They were merely Americans asking for the protection of American rights. The petition of the twenty-one he represented with a speech in praise of their "high character and standing." They represented a voting group.

Representative A. P. Gardner, one of the very few men in the House who saw things truly, was attacked and ridiculed because of his courageous stand for American rights and preparedness.

But let us give more direct evidence still.

As the campaign of 1916 got under way, it was clear that the first idea of the politicians of both parties was to do nothing to offend the German vote.

Early in January, 1916, a United States Senator, who was a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, gave an interview to a German language newspaper in Milwaukee in which he fulsomely praised the German-Americans and asked, "Why should they not have the sympathy for Germany? German blood flows in their veins. German spirit and German character speak through them." I do not object to this particularly in itself. It was objectionable because he was speaking to German-Americans as a group, and because he thought to advance his candidacy for the Presidency by praising them as a group. Moreover, he went on to blame

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

the government because it was not neutral. "If we are to be neutral, we must be neutral towards all the belligerent nations. But we permit England to destroy our American trade. We accept everything the British government does to us, and send only weak protests to that government which in addition remain unanswered. Of Germany, however, we demand that she act strictly in accordance with international law, while we do nothing to protect our life nerve, our foreign trade, against presumption and ruthlessness." ²⁶

This speech would have been helped by one statement that Germany also was ruthless. But that statement was never made by the critics of our neutrality.

As the time for the Chicago Convention neared, the demand for Roosevelt for the Republican nomination became stronger. I am not so foolish as to deny that there were powerful influences against him besides the German vote. He had mortally offended the politicians and all men to whom party regularity is dear. He was disliked by many of the conservatives of that day. He was also opposed by many who opposed war in itself and had no German affiliations. Yet the fact remains that the German-Americans defiantly announced that they would defeat him, that they worked violently to do it, that they boasted that they did defeat him, that they served an ultimatum on Senator Penrose, who had begun to look on Roosevelt with favor, and that party workers uniformly gave as

²⁶ Indianapolis *Times*, January 28, 1916.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the reason for opposing him that it "would not do to offend the German vote."

On April 29 the Illinois *Staats-Zeitung* declared: "Roosevelt may be sure that in the whole country and particularly in Illinois, the German-Americans will fight him with closed ranks."²⁷ On May 30 an official statement was made by a meeting of German-American leaders in Chicago. It said: "We demand a neutrality in strict accord with the advice contained in George Washington's address to the American people."²⁸

On June 7 a news item in the *New York Mail* stated: "We have beaten Roosevelt and we will beat any other candidate who takes Roosevelt's position on foreign affairs." It went on:

This in exact words sums up the jubilant feeling among German-Americans in New York City over the inspired reports in the German propaganda newspapers to the effect that the candidacy of Colonel Roosevelt for the Republican nomination has fizzled out. . . . Among those who talked openly and triumphantly of what they believed to have been the effect of the tremendous German propaganda against Roosevelt were Herman A. Metz, formerly comptroller of New York City and George Sylvester Viereck, editor of the *Fatherland*.

A prominent officer of the German-American society, known throughout the country, declared that 'this would be a lesson to American politicians who believed that they could ignore the German vote.' . . .

'If the Republicans will nominate Hughes or someone like

²⁷ Indianapolis *Star*, April 30, 1917.

²⁸ Indianapolis *News*, May 30, 1917.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

him, and if their candidates will come out squarely on the issues that we have quite as much right to quarrel with England as with Germany, he will get the German-American vote—and he will be elected.'

'Suppose the Republican candidate should decline to place the *Lusitania* and England's indifference with neutral trade on the same level?' he was asked.

'Then he will not get the German-American vote,' was the reply. 'The point that I am making is that we German-Americans have proved we have to be reckoned with in American politics. We are going to stand together to see fair play.'

The New York *World* editorially quoted an active agent "of the German propaganda" in New York as declaring:

'We are convinced that President Wilson is pro-British and that is the reason we are going to vote against him. Justice Hughes therefore will have the support of the German-Americans, Democrats and Republicans and I think he will be elected.'

It noted that the editor of the Cincinnati *Volksblatt* said that "the nomination is a splendid one" and the Cleveland *Waechter und Anzeiger* commended Mr. Hughes, while attacking President Wilson and Colonel Roosevelt. The *World* quotation went on:

We consider it a great boon of the Republican Convention that the people of the United States will not be compelled to choose between the present leader in unneutral subservience to England and the advocate of still greater unneutrality. . . .

In a long editorial printed yesterday, the *New Yorker Herald* cautions the Germans 'not to overdo our business' and not to make the mistake of working too openly for Hughes. After

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

declaring that the overwhelming mass of the German-Americans in the country will not fail to fall into line for the election of Charles E. Hughes, it gives this advice to the German voters:

'We Germans will beware of all mistakes in the campaign. Also not to overdo our business. As far as we can see, there is no necessity for German-Americans to work openly in the campaign. We also believe that neither for the campaign nor for the German-American Alliance is it of advantage if they and their branch associations take any kind of position in this campaign. The present election is one in which the German-Americans can participate as Republicans or Democrats but that does not include their forming a political party. Such would, aside from other severe thoughts, become rather an element of weakness than of power for German-Americans.

'We have no reason to suppress the fact that we are for Hughes, and we have no cause to be silent about the reasons that make him for us an acceptable candidate, which reasons are to be found in the anti-neutrality and injustice of President Wilson.'²⁹

On June 12 Louis E. Brandt, secretary of the German-American Alliance of Illinois, issued a statement saying that the "members of the Alliance had exerted their best political activity in working for the nomination of Charles E. Hughes." The statement added that the campaign for Mr. Hughes was planned six months before, and had crystallized at a meeting of representatives of the Alliance from all over the country in Chicago, a week ago. A meeting of the political committee will be held in Chicago on Wednesday to promulgate further plans. Mr. Brandt's statement said that letters from the Alliance

²⁹ Quoted by *Indianapolis News*, June 15, 1916, from *New York World*.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

were already going in the mails "calling on 3,000,000 members to vote for Hughes."³⁰

The German-American politicians were therefore convinced that they had defeated Roosevelt for the Republican nomination. They may have been mistaken. But if they were mistaken, the easiest thing in the world was to say so. If the German-American vote was negligible, it could have been ignored or defied.

It was not ignored nor was it defied. On the contrary, it is the sober truth that the entire Republican campaign was based on the strategy that the German vote must not be offended. This was the outspoken private expression of politicians, and the whole conduct of the campaign bears it out. Mr. Roosevelt, perforce, had to be used in the campaign because it was essential to bring the Progressive Party support into line for Mr. Hughes. He was never allowed, however, to speak in German-American strongholds. Jeremiah O'Leary denounced President Wilson as unneutral. President Wilson flatly declared that he wanted no support from O'Leary and his friends. He went to Mr. Hughes. Much furore has been raised over that interview. Mr. Hughes stated that he made no promises to O'Leary. No one doubts this. But the whole incident boils down to this: President Wilson said that he did not want his support. O'Leary saw Mr. Hughes and gave him his support, and Mr. Hughes did not repudiate it. Mr. Hughes did not care to alienate an alien group vote.

³⁰ Indianapolis *News*, June 13, 1916.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

In the midst of the campaign in a close Middle Western state, the state Republican headquarters sent out the following campaign pamphlets. They were marked sent out by Das Deutsche Bureau but they were actually mailed out from the state headquarters.

One read :

Das Deutsche Bureau Stands for Pure Unadulterated
Americanism.

Das Deutsche Bureau, like Charles E. Hughes, the Republican candidate for President, stands for America, first, last and all the time.

Wilson stands for England, instead of America. Does he not complacently permit England to control America's commerce? Does he not permit England to steal our foreign mails from neutral ships?

Wilson could preserve the high seas for American mails and American commerce, free from British interference, by placing an embargo on all foodstuffs destined for England. England would soon agree to leave us severely alone. But Wilson will not do anything to uphold America's rights as against Britain's demands.

Another read :

Das Deutsche Bureau Stands for Pure, Unadulterated
Americanism.

VOTE THE REPUBLICAN TICKET

And thereby punish Woodrow Wilson for conjuring up the know-nothing spirit among our people, whereby American citizens of German birth and even descendants of Germans are daily insulted and called disloyal, simply because they refuse to espouse England's cause and that of the ammunition manufacturers as their own.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Another read :

Das Deutsche Bureau Stands for Pure, Unadulterated
Americanism.

‘HE KEPT US OUT OF WAR.’

With Mexico? Now, quit joking. Did he or didn't he—did he?

With England? Yes; with the loss

of every shred of our commercial independence;

of any and all rights on the high seas;

of our National Honor by diplomatically ridiculing the
Wilson-Lansing notes.

With Germany? No, not Wilson, but our Constitution.

Wilson was strictly unneutral from the censoring of German wireless to permitting and even encouraging war loans to England and aiding the latter in preventing the consignment of moneys to Germany.

By permitting armed British merchantmen to enter our harbors to be laden with cannon and explosives for the murder of German men, women and children, and to insure the safe delivery to British ports of such murderous contraband, encouraging innocent American men, women and children to take passage on such British ships and thereby become the targets of German submarines.

He did everything imaginable, short of declaring war, to embroil our beloved America with Germany, and that right the Constitution denies him.

WILL WILSON KEEP US OUT OF WAR?

No, his vacillating policy in Mexico must involve us sooner or later. The loss of our commercial rights in China will entangle us with Japan. Will Germany continue to submit to British demands as made through the hypocrite, Wilson? Place our own beloved country in a similar position. Would

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

we submit? Should we submit to starving our women and babies? Never. Then why uphold Wilson?

No. 3. Das Deutsche Bureau Stands for Pure Unadulterated Americanism.

VOTE THE REPUBLICAN TICKET

And thereby give the American people a chance to assert their rights on the high seas without doing the dirty work for Great Britain.

The dirty work referred to consists of encouraging American men and innocent women and children to travel on armed English merchantmen laden with contraband. Contraband which is being used to kill men who also have wives and children equally as innocent as ours.

No. 4. Das Deutsche Bureau stands for Pure Unadulterated Americanism.

VOTE THE REPUBLICAN TICKET

Wilson says he kept us out of war. Yet, notwithstanding this great peace era of Wilson's, some of our people have been murdered almost every day for the past three years in Mexico.

We, the American people, have had to pay a so-called WAR TAX during all this time by buying revenue stamps and placing them on deeds, mortgages, notes, contracts and everything else imaginable.

Our government has been compelled to keep an army, including the National Guard either in or on the border of Mexico for three years for the purpose of catching Mr. Wilson's friend, Villa, dead or alive.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

No. 7. Das Deutsche Bureau Stands for Pure Unadulterated Americanism.

VOTE THE REPUBLICAN TICKET

And thereby give the American people a government which will not go down on its knees to England for permission to import dyestuffs and chemicals used in printing our paper money, which dyestuffs and chemicals can only be had of Germany.

We must enforce our right to trade with any and all countries, and this Wilson is not doing.

Similar circulars were sent out from the National Headquarters in Chicago. Surely comment is unnecessary. It is enough to recall that Mr. Roosevelt was making his speeches every day for the candidate for whom these same circulars were sent out.

So the campaign went to its ignoble conclusion. It is the sober truth that the German alien group vote controlled the campaign. Although, of course, in the strict sense of the words no one did or could control Mr. Hughes, it was the bitter truth that since he kept silent on the pro-German activities, he was to that extent controlled by it. It was actually easier for Republicans to blame President Wilson for our troubles, for the sinking of the *Lusitania*, than it was to blame the German government. President Wilson did not represent a voting group which the Republicans wanted and the German government did. It was easy to denounce atrocities in Mexico and the Republicans and the pro-Germans did so without limit, but they could not find it in their power to

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

denounce worse atrocities of the Germans. It was easy to denounce interference of commerce by the British but not the sinking of ships and the killing of people by the Germans. Likewise, it was easier to call on our government to forego its rights than to call on Germany not to infringe them. Senator Huston of Wisconsin sent a stirring and courageous message to some German-Americans in Milwaukee who asked him to urge the President to maintain peace, that he would listen to them when they asked the Kaiser to respect our rights as urgently as they asked President Wilson to give them up.

It is true that we cannot put all the blame for the confusion of our opinion in 1915 and 1916 on German hyphenism. The President's ill-fated and ill-conceived neutrality speech, enjoining us to be neutral in word and thought and warning us against 'passionately taking sides,' had a paralyzing effect on our opinion. There were many who conceived that loyalty to the country required silence and quiescence. His speech in 1915, when he said that Europe would some time turn to us and say, "You were right and we were wrong. You kept your head when we lost ours," and his speeches even in 1916 when he treated the war as a meaningless brawl in which both sides were wrong, and when he asked for votes on the ground that he had kept us out of war, did much to delay the formation of a manly and coherent opinion in America. There are hosts of us who, while of course we cannot prove it, will always believe that President Wilson totally misconceived

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

our opinion and that the great majority, if called on on May 8, 1915, would have responded as overwhelmingly and swept aside alien blocs at least as decisively as they did in 1917.

But it would be folly to deny that the alien blocs did enormous mischief. In the first place, they greatly influenced President Wilson. All the evidence is that he had an exaggerated idea of their strength and minimized the sentiment of the native stock. President Wilson waited until opinion forced his hand, and opinion was slow in forcing it because of his own indecision and discouragement of opinion, because many persons consider it presumptuous to have an opinion on foreign politics different from the President's, and because, as we have seen, the alien blocs played on every element of weakness, on every social, political and business interest, on every racial antagonism to Great Britain with a result, as we have seen, that it terrorized our politicians and particularly our Congress and therefore long delayed the formation of our opinion and our entrance into the war.

This argument, however, does not depend on the belief that the Allied cause was our cause and that we should have entered the war, then or later, on the side of the Allies. The essential fact was that when war came, a large group of our population reacted to German and foreign stimuli and not to native stimuli. German-Americans openly exulted in the sinking of the *Lusitania* as "our great victory."

A native opinion would have had its dissentient

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

minority, its recalcitrant elements. But in a nation of 95% one stock, the minority would have been only the minority that develops in every group. A native opinion would have had no question of warning Americans off armed ships. A native opinion would have reacted overwhelmingly to the *Lusitania*, and to the German submarine campaign. Not a normal person in a homogeneous country would have exulted in the murder of one hundred of his fellow countrymen through the sinking of a passenger vessel.

But we hear much nowadays of British propaganda and of British opinion in the United States. Well, the simple truth is that there was no British propaganda whatever by the British-born in the United States—none whatever. There were no British-American alliances. There was no French propaganda by French organizations in this country. The only propaganda that could be said to have an Allied source was the news. But the Reuter service furnished its dispatches as well, and they were regularly printed. The Germans had a large part of the press at their disposal; more newspapers, in fact, were outspokenly for Germany than were outspokenly for the Allies. The statements by German public men, their communiqués, their arguments were all published. As we have seen, there was enormous organized German publicity. German propaganda certainly had its chance and if it failed it was partly because it was poorly done and partly because its cause was weak. That may be a bit dogmatic, but it is the wholesome truth.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

After all, despite all the post-war revision, it remains true that the essential pro-Ally propaganda was valid in its facts and its conclusions. Germany did refuse the conference asked for by Edward Grey and assented to by Russia and France and Austria. She did accept the Russian mobilization as a cause for war although her own military men admitted that Russian mobilization was not to be feared and that it did not necessarily mean war. She did enter Belgium, she did annex it, and she did sink the *Lusitania*.

Above all, the evidence of the ambition for "World Power or Downfall" as testified to by American travelers and students who heard on every hand in Germany in the ten years before the war the determination to "bleed France white" and then crush England, still stands and it is worth a ton of documents. I ask all those martyred revisionists who dwell on the evils of the post-war period, for every hour they indulge in such speculations to spend but five minutes contemplating the terror we would have faced if we had stayed out of the war and Germany had been victorious. If Germany had won, the pro-German element in the United States would have felt triumphant. They would have insisted that we follow the conqueror's lead. Our politics would have been divided into two camps, German and anti-German. As for Germany herself, if she had won the war the megalomania of her past would have been nothing to the megalomania of her future. America would have known no peace until perhaps alone, certainly if aided at all aided only by spent

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

and wearied allies, she had fought the German power. It was a profound instinct that forced the war when it did instead of ten years later.

It is inconceivable that the old America, the America of 1880, would have been so torn by divided counsels. Our immigration weakened our unity and with it our power of decision.

This may seem naïve to the post-war revisionists, it may seem still obsessed by the hysteria of 1917 and 1918. But sophistication and cynicism are not necessarily wisdom.

So I think there is little basis for the charge that the pro-Ally sentiment was also based on alien sources. Though half of our white population is of British origin, in all my life I have never heard of an appeal to the British vote. Of all countries in Europe, England is the easiest for our politicians to attack simply because the population of British origin does not react to foreign stimuli. The newer arrivals are so like us that generally they fall easily and imperceptibly into our ranks. The older stock of British origin, bred up on Revolutionary and Civil War memories, is more apt to be suspicious of England than overfavorable to her. Most of it, as I have remarked before, does not even know whence it came. It is rooted here. It is native.

When the war started, and even when we entered the war, England had our sympathy as an outsider and not as one of our flesh and blood. In fact, England won her way in spite of great disadvantages. If England had done what Germany did, we would

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

have been at war with her a year before we were at war with Germany.

France had our sympathy much more than England, yet only 2% of our population is of French origin, and in 1910 only 292,389 were of French parentage as against 8,282,618 of German parentage, or 1 to 28.

I cannot recall a single pro-Ally organization which was not led by Americans of long standing in this country, and, as I have noted in treating the force of tradition, without exception the men who led our opinion were men of long American ancestry.

Moreover, the pro-Ally sentiment, though it existed from the day the Germans entered Belgium, never became active and never organized itself until the sinking of the *Lusitania*, an act of war against the United States. Even then it was slow to act; it waited for official leadership. Each new aggression against the United States gave it new strength. The pro-German opinion, on the other hand, organized from the beginning. It held mass meeting after mass meeting in behalf of an embargo on munitions and later of warning Americans off armed ships, while the anti-German sentiment remained silent, active only in individuals, sad at heart and fearful of the future. The pro-German sentiment was all for giving up American rights; the pro-Ally for maintaining them. One was foreign and the other native in background and desire.

The pro-Ally sentiment was not racial except that by psychology, by political training, by like-mind-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

edness, we instinctively understood the British better than the Germans, just as Wilson understood Lloyd George better at Paris than he understood Clemenceau, and Hughes understood Balfour better at the Washington conference than he understood the French representatives.

The German-Americans cannot understand this. They could not understand a native American sentiment, based on our political traditions. One woman of second generation German status, exclaimed in 1915 to a pro-Ally: "We have feelings. You have only opinions." She could not see that the inherited love of our political traditions might give us feelings too. German-Americans instinctively ascribed all pro-Ally opinion to business reasons or to personal feeling as due to the marriage of a friend or relative to an Englishman or Englishwoman, or to English descent, but never to American conviction.

It may be said that this account of the pro-German propaganda in this country is a cruel and unfair slur on a large part of our population, which did its part nobly in the war. Indeed, it is frequently said that the loyalty of the German population during the war proves that the propaganda did not represent it. With our usual American optimism, we are prone to say that the propaganda was the work of a few noise-makers and that the bulk of the German population had no sympathy with it. I have in the beginning expressly excluded Americans of German descent from this history of pro-German activity.

It should be noted that in the above pages I have

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

based little, if anything, on my own opinion. I have loaded the record with evidence, and most of the evidence is the words of the German-Americans themselves. Their own record speaks. If the numbers involved in this activity were small, then our newspapers, our business men, and our politicians, all of whom bowed to the weight of this alien group opinion, were all woefully misled. But to prove that a force was unsuccessful in its object does not prove that it did not exist. As for the army, I would be the last to deny the men of German origin the glory of their achievements. But it must be remembered that the dominant stock of the army was native. The officers, particularly in the beginning, were predominantly native. The alien recruit was subjected to an enormous force of assimilation. The army was a melting-pot such as the most fervid dreamers of the melting-pot had never imagined. If we could subject all of our population to the assimilative force of the army, the dangers of immigration would be lessened immeasurably. The recruit was taught the ritual of reveille and retreat, the meaning of the colors, the prestige of our arms, something of the history of our army, and he lived daily, generally for a year or more, side by side with men from all parts of the country and all, native, foreign, men of six and one generations in this country mixed in together. There were no racial groups left. And the army did not vote on its policies. It did not act by majority opinion.

I have made no charges against the individual

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

courage, the lovableness, the kindness of any alien. That would be both folly and unkindness. Too many of these men I associated with day after day and came to trust and admire, for me to make so puerile a charge. I have simply said that in the majority of cases it is psychologically impossible for an alien to feel and think like a native. His conduct may be exemplary, but his psychology is uncontrollable.

But action was easier for the alien than opinion. Once the die was cast and action only was needed, their choice was made and most of them responded finely.

Yet, when we are told that the alien sentiment was not powerful we should recall that in the fall of 1917 Hillquit polled 143,328 votes in New York City on an anti-war platform. In April, 1918, Victor Berger received 110,487 votes for Senator in Wisconsin. In the midst of the Argonne drive he was elected to Congress in Milwaukee, and Thompson, running for the Republican nomination for Senator in Illinois with an anti-war record, received 132,511 votes and carried the city of Chicago.

With the end of the war, the enthusiasm and élan which had animated our alien groups passed from them as, alas! it did from so many of us. The normal—shall we call it normal?—psychology returned, and the alien groups became alien again. The end of the war left many problems to adjust with Europe, and in each one of them the alien thinking of alien groups has had its part. The German population inevitably reverted to a point of view favorable to Germany.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

There was the question of the German indemnity, and the peace treaty itself. There was the question of whether Italy or Yugoslavia should get Fiume. There was the question of whether Greece should receive the Ægean Islands and part of Asia Minor. There was the question of whether Ireland should be free. All of these questions entered into American politics, and on all the foreign groups had their say as foreign groups.

Early in 1920 some of the leaders of the Hughes German organization, organized to aid Harding under the name of the German-American Citizens' League, declared that its objects were: "To arouse all Americans, especially those of German descent, to a realization of their civic rights, to solidify the Americans of German descent, to create voting units irrespective of party affiliations in opposition to invisible government, to elect city, state, and national officers in sympathy with the purposes of the committee, to restore free speech, to combat race intolerance, to devise ways and means of co-operating with the Irish-Americans, to save the honor of the United States, by revising the Peace Treaty of Versailles, to establish cordial relations between the United States and all other nations, especially Germany, and to rebuke those who would make the United States a 'colony of Great Britain.' " Mr. John Hering, editor of the *Long Island Free Press*, the only German newspaper in Queens County, New York, and a leader in this movement, declared: "We favor Senator Hard-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

ing because we are opposed to the League of Nations.”³¹

But let us follow the actions of German-Americans without any more reference than is incidentally necessary to the campaign of 1920, the fight on the treaty, the world court, the principal questions in the last few years on which alien prejudices and opinion have been aroused. As I have treated the pro-Germans somewhat separately during the war, I will follow them separately a little further, with a few instances to show that their pre-war attitude still obtains to a large degree.

In 1921 an amazing mass meeting was held in New York City, in Madison Square Garden, to protest against the occupation of the Rhine country by the French. It is now called the “Rhine horror” meeting. The name of President Wilson was booed and hissed. One speaker declared:

This is a significant meeting. Do you realize, those of you who are of German extraction, that if we who are of Irish extraction, and you will come together in this land [loud applause] as we have the right to do, we are in the majority here, and we should act as a majority should act; that we would quickly banish into the mists whence it came this phantom of Anglo-Saxonism. It doesn’t exist.

He declared that Americans would decide what was a just peace,

and when the envoys shall come to us from Germany, they shall find an intelligent, erect, manly and well-organized

³¹ *New York Times*, September 4, 1920.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

America to meet them, honorably and justly, and they shall meet us gathered together in one strong and solid phalanx, we Americans of Irish and of German blood, [applause] we are Americans. [Applause and cheers for the Irish Republic.]

One speaker flatly charged that the Secretary of State lied when he said that there were no black troops on the Rhine.³²

One comment on this outbreak is sufficient. It was made at a meeting a few days later in protest of the "Rhine horror" meeting, by General Pershing. "We have no quarrel," he said, "with Americans of foreign birth or stock, who cling to the music, the folklore, and the better traditions of the old land. . . . But we do object to the foreign-born citizen who attempts to decide American questions for a foreign reason."³³ A pregnant sentence surely. It sums up the entire point I have tried to make so far. Hardly without exception, the quotations I have given from German-Americans have been opinions on American subjects based on foreign reasons.

I shall give only one instance of German alienism in the election of 1922. It was a repercussion into Nebraska, where Hitchcock was up for election.

A *New York Times* correspondent wrote on October 28, 1920:

If what one hears on all sides in Nebraska is true, the Germans of this state are united as never before in their history. The assertion that a large proportion of them are lined up to rebuke at the polls, those public men who in the great war backed the Wilson administration, and who, when the war

³² *Ibid.*, March 1, 1921.

³³ *Ibid.*, March 19, 1921.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

was won took the position that Germany should pay for wrongs committed, would also seem to be based on truth. That such is the case, is indicated by the fact that such questions as the French occupation of the Rhineland, the modification of the Treaty of Versailles and the granting of various favors to the Germans are among the issues one hears talked about in the campaign now under way. . . . Not one but a dozen men of standing in Nebraska have told the Times correspondent that had Hitchcock taken the course La Follette followed during the war, his reelection November 7 would be a foregone conclusion. . . .

Both of the big parties are fighting for the votes of the Germans.³⁴

At a meeting in Chicago on Washington's Birthday, 1923, a resolution was adopted requesting our "government to exert pressure on the French government to withdraw at once the invading troops from the Rhine district as a first requisite towards establishing concord and good understanding among all nations."³⁵ The chief speaker was an Irishman who spoke at many pro-German mass meetings in 1915 and 1916.

Shortly after the war the Steuben Society was organized. One of its members, the son of its president, told an investigator of the New York *Tribune* (now the *Herald-Tribune*), "that its purpose was to obtain political influence for Americans of German descent," and added that it already had succeeded in keeping the politicians guessing. As he put it,

³⁴ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1920.

³⁵ Chicago *Tribune*, February 23, 1923.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

"They're not only guessing, but they're doing a lot of hopping for us down there in Washington." As another Steubenite explained it, "With the attainment of our membership goal we will become an irresistible power in the political, economic and social affairs of the United States."³⁶

It would appear that the Steuben Society is a blood descendant of the German-American Alliance. It defends the sinking of the *Lusitania*. It notes with approval such judgments as, "The American people were bamboozled into the World War with a series of cowardly catchwords," and it holds the belief that we entered the war "to save American investments in English and French war loans"—the usual catchwords of the pro-Germans and their followers who have the opposition complex. Its objects are certainly as alien in tone as those of the former body, and it would seem that the later organization has learned nothing from the fate of its predecessor. Its declared objects are:

The Revision of the Treaty of Versailles, because the Society believes it to be confiscatory, unjust, destructive and immoral.

Return of the German property in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian and adequate compensation for confiscated patents and rights, as an act in the interest of our national dignity, honor and good faith.

Reversal of the verdict that Germany was responsible for the World War, since that can no longer be maintained in the face of conclusive proof to the contrary and not to contradict

³⁶ Quoted in Editorial, *New York Times*, April 15, 1923.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

it is to admit it, and expose men and women of German blood to continued hatred and prejudice.

Revision of the treason text in the history books of the public schools as calculated to debase our children's reverence for the integrity of the Fathers of the Republic and destructive of American ideals.

The protection of naturalized German-born citizens against proceedings to cancel their citizenship, holding such proceedings to be unconstitutional, since no similar action can be taken against a native-born citizen.

The restoration of German in the public schools on par with French and Spanish as a means of broadening public education and opening up the minds of the rising generation to the treasure-house of Germanic poetry, history and science.

The teaching of the doctrine that it is our duty to defend not only the Constitution, but the Independence of the United States.

To present to the American people in the form of books, bulletins, pamphlets and newspapers, a clear view of the pioneer work of the German element in the making of America, covering a period of 250 years, from Peter Minnewit and Jacob Leisler to Generals von Steuben, Herkimer, Muehlenberg, Osterhaus, Sigel, Carl Follen, Francis Lieber and Carl Schurz.

The revision of the Immigration Act of 1924 which in a clause that goes into effect in July, 1927, discriminates against the admission of German immigrants in favor of British immigration, because the facts on which the act is based are prompted by race hatred and false historic information.

Surely an alien society! Surely most of these objects are those of Germans in America.

When La Follette was nominated in 1924, he made a direct and vigorous bid for the German-American vote. On September 10, 1924, a committee of the

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Steuben Society came to him in Washington, promised him the support of the Society and pledged him 6,000,000 votes of men and women of German blood. La Follette's speech in answer was full of praise of the German element of our population. He said, in the words of the *New York Times* dispatch, that "the support accorded him by the German element in the Wisconsin electorate had been an indispensable part of his success in carrying forward progressive principles in his home State."³⁷ He amplified these remarks in an address on September 22, when he was the principal speaker at Steuben Day in New York City. He said to the men of this Society, which at that moment desired to use the German voters as a unit in American politics:

The Steuben Society is an American society of unimpeachable attachments to the fundamental principles of the Constitution. Many of its members date their ancestry back to the colonists of the seventeenth century. You are a loyal, patriotic organization, which would preserve and foster home sentiment, and interest in the history, traditions, and achievements of your forebears especially as they stimulate high ideals for this generation of American citizens.³⁸

In a speech at St. Louis on October 14, he bitterly criticized President Wilson for involving us in the war. If he had adhered to his absolute neutrality policy of 1914, which he declared was "a true American policy,"

We would be free from every form of foreign entanglement.

³⁷ *New York Times*, September 11, 1924.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, September 23, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

highly trained technicians, representatives of important professions and especially farmers.

He declared that the Government must find some means to preserve the latter classes for the fatherland by providing work for them, adding:

'The advancement of German culture necessitates a determined cultivation of Germanism abroad. Unfortunately, efforts in this direction are insufficient and disorganized. Better methods and more organization are required. The Ministry of the Interior must have a central department for the cultivation of Germanism. The question of the cultural security of the minorities inside and outside of Germany also demands greater attention.'

CHAPTER IX

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT—THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE IRISH REPUBLIC

DURING 1915 and 1916, the professional Irish politician and a large part of the population of Irish descent joined in with the German campaign against the Allies. It was enough for them that England was on the Allied side. But the outstanding activity of the Irish population, as a voting group, came with the Peace Conference. It came with the demand for a free Ireland. To realize the reaction this demand for freedom on behalf of the Irish Republic made on England, our ally in the war just over, it must be recalled that in the midst of the World War, when England was fighting with her back to the wall, the Sinn Fein movement struck her a blow in the back. In other words, it struck a blow for the German cause.

Roger Casement was arrested, tried and sentenced to death. The United States Senate, by vote of 46 to 19, passed a resolution asking clemency for him. It was as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate expresses the hope that the British government may exercise clemency in the treatment of Irish prisoners and that the President be requested to transmit this resolution to that government.¹

¹ Congressional Record, July 29, 1916.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Let us assume that Japan had a large Filipino population. If then in 1918 the Filipinos had revolted, what would we have said to a resolution of the Japanese parliament asking us to use clemency towards the ringleader?

After the war ended the pressure began again.

On May 4, 1919, eighty-eight members of the House sent a message to Lloyd George and the British Parliament protesting against the imprisonment of political offenders in Ireland, and asking that hereafter the right of trial be accorded without unusual delay.

On June 6, 1919, the Friends of the Irish Republic obtained the passage by a vote of 60 to 1 of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States earnestly requests the American Peace Commission at Versailles to endeavor to secure for Edward de Valera, Arthur Griffiths and Count George Noble Plunkett a hearing before the Peace Conference, in order that they may present the cause of Ireland.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States expresses its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of its own choice.²

The resolution was passed by a vote of 60 to 1. Only John Sharp Williams opposed it.

The passage of the resolution was only the first gun in the fight for the Irish Republic. The attitude with which it was carried on is significant. Senator Walsh of Montana said in the Senate on July 28, 1919: "There are individual opponents of the

² *Ibid.*, June 6, 1919.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

League, many of them, but no particular class is arraigned against it but the Irish." Senator Thomas quoted in the Senate a letter attacking him stating:

The only places where we [the Democrats] made any gains last fall, were in districts heavily populated by the Irish.

You are living in the past if you think that there are any Irish in this country left who support the old Nationalistic Party . . . without the support of the Irish people, our party will remain in a hopeless minority for a long time to come.³

On August 30 and 31, 1919, friends of the Irish Republic appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and bitterly attacked the League Covenant as unfair to Ireland. Judge Daniel F. Cohalan referred to the "Irish societies" and "Irish citizens" demanding "this action," namely rejection of the Covenant for the sake of Ireland. He said, "We Irish think there should be no abandonment of the policy laid down by Washington in his Farewell Address of keeping away from permanent entangling alliances with any of the countries of the Old World." He said that "We should neither take part in the quarrels of the Old World nor permit them to take part in our quarrels." A senator asked him "why is it that the Irish senators are so lukewarm?"⁴

The political pressure was steady and violent. On December 13, 1919, hearings were held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on a bill to appropriate funds to send diplomatic and consular repre-

³ *Ibid.*, June 25, 1919.

⁴ *New York Times*, December 14, 1919.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

sentatives accredited to the "Irish Republic." One of the speakers before the Committee said that upwards of 20,000,000 of Americans of Irish blood were asking recognition for the "Republic." The Presidential Commission estimates that our population from South Ireland or descended from people from South Ireland is only 8,317,200. There was a slight exaggeration, therefore, but some credit is due to the speaker for referring to them as Americans of Irish blood and not merely as Irishmen.

Mr. Bourke Cochran was asked if he favored war in case England took offense at the bill. He answered that his reply was that of Lincoln before the Civil War when he said:

"Let us not be frightened by threats of danger to the country or of dungeons for ourselves * * * * but let us go forward and do our duty as God gives us to see it."

"Mr. Chairman, that is my answer when asked what consequence an act of justice by the American people may entail or involve."

He asked it in the name of 18 per cent of our population which he said "are of Irish blood." He said, "Between 35 and 40 per cent of the American Expeditionary Forces were Irish," an amusing absurdity.

Judge Daniel F. Cohalan replied to the same question as to the danger of war: "I say that in my opinion we would never be faced with any such contingency as that; but in the face of that, I insist and reiterate that as an American citizen I would be in favor of doing that which was just."⁵

⁵Chicago *Tribune*, December 13, 1919.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

It will be noticed how instinctively the speakers refer to the Irish, Irish citizens, Irish societies. They insist that the Irish will not support the old Nationalist party, which is a party of Ireland and not of the United States. They speak of Irish Senators. They do not even refer to them as Irish-Americans.

Secondly, it is significant that the friends of the "Irish Republic" were determined to obtain American aid for the "Irish Republic" and to obtain that they were determined to defeat the League of Nations. Indeed, they were against the League not merely because they thought it militated against the Irish Republic, but for the simple reason that England was in it. We shall see how this campaign was carried on. It was carried on by mass meetings, by newspaper advertisements, and political pressure on legislatures, party conventions and Congress.

The following advertisement appeared day after day in the Chicago papers:

The American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic.

1. This is not an Irish Society. It is an Association of American citizens (men and women). It is non-sectarian.
2. The Object of the Association is to maintain the traditional policy of America in recognizing Republics duly established by the will of the people.
3. Eighty-one percent (81%) of the people of Ireland, at the last general election (1918) declared for a Republican form of government.
4. Ireland asks the United States for official recognition.
5. To Recognize Republics is the essence of Americanism.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Already we have recognized fourteen such governments in various parts of the world. 'How can we consistently refuse to recognize people who ask to establish our form of government?' (Jefferson).

6. Join the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic if you want to uphold the traditional policy of our country.

Great advertisements were published in the newspapers calling for the sale of Irish bonds. One read as follows:

IRISH BOND CERTIFICATE CAMPAIGN OPENED FOR ILLINOIS JAN. 18 KEEP UP THE FIGHT

We must and shall win recognition for the Irish Republic		
Every bond	To the Liberty-Loving People of	Every bond
certificate you buy	America	certificate you buy
will help		will help

The proceeds of this first issue will be used for National purposes as directed by the Elected Parliament of Ireland, including:

The organization of a National Civil Service and National Courts of Justice.

The establishment of Consular services to promote Irish trade and commerce.

<i>Keep Ireland for The Irish</i>	The fostering of Irish industries, e.g., the development of the Irish Sea fisheries, the appointment of a Commission to hold public inquiries into and report upon the industrial resources and possibilities of the country.	<i>Put the Irish Flag on Every Sea</i>
	The establishment of a Loan Mortgage	

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Repeople the Land Bank to finance the resettling of untenanted lands. *Abolish the Slums*

The encouragement of reafforestation.

For these purposes, among others, appropriations have already been authorized by the Government and sanctioned by the National Assembly.

Harness the Rivers

EAMON DE VALERA
President of the Elected Government of the Republic of Ireland.

Start the Looms Spinning

Turn her Face to The Rising Sun

Drain the Bogs Lift Ireland Up

AMERICAN COMMISSION ON
IRISH INDEPENDENCE

ILLINOIS COUNCIL

Irish Bond Certificate Committee
323 Ashland Block, Chicago, Ills.

Frank P. Walsh, National Chairman

Richard W. Wolfe, Ex. Pres. Cook
County Real Estate Board,
Illinois Chairman

John A. McGarry, President
John A. McGarry Construction
Co., Chicago Chairman.

John M. Murphy, M.D., Secretary.
William J. Grace, Executive
Secretary.

M. H. Hoey, President and
Counsel of Globe Mutual Life
Insurance Co., Treasurer.

DO IT THIS WAY NOW
To EAMON DE VALERA,
President of the Republic of
Ireland:

I,.....hereby tender to
the Government of the Republic of
Ireland the sum of \$.....
This sum is voluntarily subscribed
by me. Neither the President of the
said Republic of Ireland, nor its
agents, are under any obligation to
repay this sum, or to pay interest
on said sum to me or to my heirs
until the said Republic of Ireland
is internationally recognized and un-
til the lapse of six months from the
date of the freedom from British
military control of the territory of
the said Republic of Ireland.

Signed.....

Address.....

City.....

At a meeting in Chicago on April 18, 1920, about
\$2,500,000 was pledged to the cause in a great meet-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

ing in Medinah Temple, at which the Mayor of Chicago gave an address of welcome.

As a result of this campaign, the United States Senate acted again in behalf of the Irish Republic.

On March 17, 1920, the following reservation to the League Covenant was adopted by a vote of 38 to 36:

In consenting to the ratification of the treaty with Germany the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination and to the resolution of sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice adopted by the Senate June 6, 1919, and declares that when self-government is attained by Ireland, a consummation it is hoped is at hand, it should promptly be admitted as a member of the League of Nations.⁶

A great effort was made to obtain resolutions in favor of the Irish Republic from the Republican and Democratic National Conventions of 1920. The resolution proposed for the Republican Convention was to the effect that it favored the principle of recognition without intervention and that the nation accord to Ireland "full, formal and official recognition, thus vindicating the principles for which our soldiers offered up their lives in the recent war."

The leaders of the Irish Republic Cause quarreled before the Republican Convention and the result was that the convention adopted no plank at all. One party asked for full recognition, and the other asked for a resolution of sympathy. The result was that neither was adopted.

⁶ Congressional Record, March 17, 1920.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

The next onslaught was on the Democratic Convention. A demand was made for flat recognition in practically the same language as that asked of the Republican Convention. The resolution was not adopted, although a resolution of sympathy was.

During the campaign Governor Cox repeatedly promised that if elected he would bring the Irish question before the League of Nations. He said: "Well, under this new order, it will be possible to have her case presented to the bar of the world's opinion. Article XI of the League Covenant specifies that it is the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations, which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends."⁷

Even President Eliot urged this as a reason for electing Governor Cox. He said:

If the League were in unembarrassed operation, discussion of the Irish question in the Assembly of the Council would be absolutely appropriate, and indeed, a natural and desirable use of the representative bodies instituted by the League of Nations. I venture to suggest that the Central Council of Irish County Associations use all of its influence, forthwith—, the time is short—[the date was October 24] in support of the Democratic Party and its candidate, Governor Cox—who has distinctly stated that if elected President he will bring the Irish problem to the attention of the League of Nations.⁸

Here was a direct appeal to the Irish vote on a

⁷ *New York Times*, October 3, 1920.

⁸ *Ibid.*, October 24, 1920.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

question of British politics. A parallel case would be for the British Liberals to favor bringing the case of the Philippines or, in 1861, of the Confederacy before the League.

An indication of the pressure exerted by the Irish vote is given by a dispatch from the *New York Times* of October 3, 1920, which contained the account of Governor Cox's speech above referred to. It said:

The 'Irish' question bulks large in Missouri politics. Senator Reed, the Democratic irreconcilable, has gone to great lengths to stir up opposition among citizens of Irish origin to the League. It has been said if the Irish voters refused to be convinced that Article X did not strike at the right of Ireland to continue her fight for freedom, they would swing the state to Harding.

On October 1, 1920, the *New York Times* contained an article in which Chairman George White of the Democratic party charged that Harding was not a friend of the Irish. The article began:

With the Irish vote 'off the reservation' and the Republicans making a strong bid for it, Chairman George White of the Democratic National Committee, yesterday cited the record of Warren G. Harding, Republican National standard bearer while a member of the United States Senate, to show that in important measures affecting Ireland, he had indicated an utter lack of sympathy with the Irish cause.

Harding, he declared, had voted against the Senate resolutions in favor of Ireland, while Cox had declared that he would bring Ireland's cause before the League.

Yet despite the fact that the Democratic party de-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

clared its sympathy for Ireland and its candidate said that he would bring its cause before the League, although the Republican party made no declaration, apparently the Irish vote went to Harding. The Irish-American voters hated the League partly merely because England was in it with six votes (although we had Cuba, Panama, Haiti, Guatemala and San Domingo, which were far more dominated by us than the British Dominions by Great Britain), but largely because they interpreted Article X as an agreement to use force to repel internal revolution and not external aggression as it clearly means. But that the Irish-American vote deserted Cox we have no less an authority than Mr. George Brennan, leader of the Democratic party in Illinois. On September 3, 1923, he visited ex-President Wilson. "Mr. Wilson, it was understood, asked Mr. Brennan to explain why the Irish Democrats had been alienated, and Mr. Brennan told him bluntly how certain acts of the Wilson Administration had led them to believe that the administration was not friendly to the aspirations of the Irish, then fighting for Independence."⁹

But the Irish agitation was not limited to the National Congress and conventions. Though the Friends of Ireland failed to obtain recognition from either national party convention, or from Congress, they succeeded with many state conventions and legislatures. For example, the Illinois Legislature adopted a resolution attacking England in a way

⁹ *Ibid.*, September 14, 1923.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Germany was attacked in no convention I have heard of save in war-time. It had a long series of whereases and ended :

Be it therefore resolved by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly that we sincerely sympathize with the Irish people in their heroic struggle for national independence, and condemn with all the force at our command, the brutal and wanton murder of innocent Irish priests, sisters and laymen by British soldiers, now unjustly occupying the sacred soil of Ireland;

Be it further resolved that a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Secretary of State of the United States at Washington, D. C., coupled with the request that he at once recommend to Congress the passage of such necessary measures as will enable our American nation to recognize the Republic of Ireland now established by the will of 85% of its brave and patriotic people and thus show the civilized world that from our beloved America still radiates the joy and hope of all small nations struggling to be free.¹⁰

In December, 1921, forty-four Americans, including former Governor Dunne of Illinois, Mayor Hoan of Milwaukee, Senator Norris of Nebraska, Senator Walsh of Massachusetts, and Congressman Burke of Pennsylvania, sent a "Christmas" message "To the people of India." It said :

The United States of America has never failed to extend sympathy and support to all peoples who were struggling for freedom.

A short time ago our army returned from overseas after having brought victory to the allied cause. Our entrance into this great struggle was predicated upon the principle that 'the

¹⁰ Chicago *American*, June 2, 1921.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed' and our aid was accepted by the allies upon the theory that at the close of the war peoples everywhere should be permitted to determine for themselves the character of government under which they shall live.

Our right not only to sympathize with the people of India and Ireland and Egypt who are struggling for the right of self-determination but to give them active support is conceded by the promises of our associates in the great war and sealed by the blood of our soldiers.

Accordingly we send our sympathy to the people of India, and our assurance that we will do all we may to promote the success of their struggle.¹¹

Six days later a dispatch appeared in the *New York Times* stating that:

A republic has been proclaimed in India by leaders in the Nationalist movement, an armed defense has been sanctioned, according to an announcement made here [Washington] to-night by Sailendra N. Ghose, director of the unofficial American Commission to Promote Self-Government in India. Mr. Ghose gave out this message as having been received by himself to-day from India:

'Republic declared. American message decided. Armed defense sanctioned. Boycott extended to individuals. Women, children safe.'¹²

The American message alluded to, it was explained, was the above address "To the people of India."

So the Irish propaganda extended itself to encouraging revolt in India, although as in the other cases

¹¹ *Chicago Tribune*, December 26, 1921.

¹² *New York Times* January 2, 1922.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

it was clear that the responsibility of the signers of the message would end with signing it. It was all a part of the plan to make as much trouble for England as possible in order to aid the Irish campaign.

A resolution was adopted by the Chicago Board of Aldermen asking Harding to recognize "the elected government of the Republic of Ireland." The State Democratic convention of Rhode Island on May 6, 1920, directed the Rhode Island delegates "to the National Convention to do everything in their power to the end that the Irish Republic be recognized by the government of the United States."

The fight was carried into the Federation of Labor. In the Denver Convention of 1920 a resolution was adopted urging that "the military forces of occupation be withdrawn" and that "the Irish people be accorded the 'right of self-determination'" and called on the officers of the Federation to carry out the terms of the resolution.¹³ Almost a year later the Chicago *Herald-Examiner* (on June 2, 1921) in an editorial headed: "Why Has Gompers failed to Carry out Instructions Concerning Ireland?" referred to the fact that the 1920 convention instructed "Mr. Gompers to tender his services to the Irish Republic to do what he could to aid the Irish cause."

"That resolution," it said, "is now almost a year old, and has all this time lain a dead letter on the records of the federation's convention.

"Mr. Samuel Gompers has done nothing to carry out the instructions of his organization in all this

¹³ *Ibid.*, June 17, 1920.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

year, when the fate of Irish freedom has hung so fearfully in the balance."

The 1921 convention at Montreal reaffirmed this 1920 resolution. A desperate effort was made to pass a resolution declaring for a drastic boycott on British goods, and the moderates felt that they had achieved a victory in defeating the boycott provisions and accepting a resolution which demanded recognition of the Irish Republic and asking all national and international unions to urge the administration officials at Washington and all members of Congress to pass immediately legislation recognizing the Irish Republic.¹⁴

In December, 1919, Admiral Sims published a magazine article in which he referred to the attacks on our sailors in Cork and the damage done our cause in the war by the Sinn Fein organization. This article should not be confused with his speech two years later in London, which will be referred to in a moment. The magazine article of 1919 gave a mere statement of facts. It told how the Sinn Fein organization hampered the work of the American Navy and of the hostility of Sinn Fein sympathizers to our sailors, and expressed the opinion that the Sinn Fein had caused the loss of American lives. The sympathizers with the Irish Republic immediately asked that Sims be discharged. The Irish Nationalist Bureau in Washington demanded of Secretary Daniels that he direct the admiral to retract the charges and punish him. To his credit, be it said,

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, June 16, 1921.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

he refused. In his London speech Sims emphasized again that the "whole truth of the business is there is blood of English and American boys on their hands." Then in his bluff, hard-hitting, sailor fashion he expressed his contempt for the deference of our politicians to alien opinion. Much of his language was clearly an indiscretion but, as Julian Street, George Barr McCutcheon and Wallace Irwin said in an open letter at the time, it was "a bully" one. Surely he had been laid under great provocation.

The admiral became at once the center of a tempest of abuse. Demands were boldly made for his head. Judge Cohalan said: "He should be removed at once."¹⁵ The Senate adopted a resolution for an investigation and the furore was only abated when Secretary Denby administered a severe rebuke, more severe than the offense warranted.

Mayor Curley of Boston was not satisfied with the rebuke. He refused to sit on the same platform with Admiral Sims at a meeting in Boston the following January. He said: "I have no desire to sit on any platform with Admiral Sims, retired, whose best service to the American Navy was his retirement from it. I would suggest that when he is done shooting off the only weapon he is expert at—his mouth—he be escorted to the Cunard or White Star dock and given an opportunity to follow the trail and example of his ante-type, Benedict Arnold."¹⁶ Apparently it was treason against one's country to question the Sinn Fein.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, June 10, 1921.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, January 22, 1923.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

On March 17, 1921, the Friends of Irish Freedom in Chicago, protested in the name of patriotism and Christianity against the fête proposed in honor of Viviani because of his record on religious questions in French politics.

The Sinn Fein in America time and again manifested a desire to suppress opposing opinion, and to taboo all persons or organizations it did not like.

A few days after the "Rhine horror" meeting in February, 1921 (referred to in Chapter VIII), a New York Legion Post held a meeting to take action in regard to it. The meeting was invaded by Sinn Feiners who tried to break it up by disorderly cries, hisses and catcalls. It adopted a resolution condemning the statements of a late officer of the United States Army who spoke at the "Rhine horror" meeting, which in its opinion "publicly cast a contemptible slur upon the United States Navy."

On March 27, 1921, a meeting in New York under the auspices of the Clan-na-Gael and the Cumann-na-Ban, at which Judge Cohalan, John Devoy and Justice Gavegan spoke, adopted a resolution calling on "all former soldiers of Irish blood to resign from the American Legion, 'whose leaders have proved themselves to be most offensive and provocative Anglomaniacs and agents of British propaganda.'"¹⁷

In October, 1920, Major George Haven Putnam on two different occasions was hooted and booed because he spoke a word of friendliness for our late

¹⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, March 28, 1921.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

ally, England. The *New York Times*' account of the meeting of October 11 reads in part as follows:

There was absolute silence when Major Putnam stepped on the platform, but the storm broke when Benjamin M. Jacquist, a member of the Erasmus High School faculty stepped forward to introduce him. With a suddenness that indicated pre-arrangement, hisses and cat-calls came from all over the hall. Mr. Jacquist endeavored to restore order by crying out for fair-play and saying that Mr. Putnam was entitled to a hearing, but was himself howled down.

Some one of the promoters of the meeting notified the police station and three policemen came into the hall, but found it impossible to restore order completely although they succeeded in getting a half dozen persons who seemed to be leaders of the hostile demonstration to leave the hall. . . .

Aided by the efforts of Mr. Jacquist, Major Putnam at last succeeded in getting started. 'Some years ago when I was in England,' he began, but got no further in words that were audible. The mention of England apparently incensed the audience for the jeering and hissing began with redoubled intensity.¹⁸

In the end this honored patriot, whose ancestors had fought in the wars of 1776 and 1812, and who had fought himself in the Civil War, who had done as much as any one person to arouse us to our duty in the World War, was forced to give up his talk. Yet Sinn Fein meeting after meeting had been held without trouble in New York and other cities. A few weeks later he attempted to speak again in the same place, and under a guard of twenty-four policemen

¹⁸ *New York Times*, October 12, 1920.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

was able to finish his speech but was "frequently interrupted by coughing, boos and cat-calls so that at times he could not be heard." When he finished the presiding officer said: "I don't agree with much of what Major Putnam said, but I want to take off my hat to him, for the way he finished his speech in spite of the most contemptible demonstration on the part of an audience that I have ever seen."¹⁹

On Thanksgiving Day, 1920, the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims, the Union Club of New York, expecting as guests the French ambassador, Jules Jusserand, and General Nivelle, displayed on either side of the American flag the flags of our late allies—indeed, as peace had not yet been declared, our then present allies, England and France. Across the street at St. Patrick's Cathedral a mass was to be said at noon for the repose of the soul of the late Mayor Terence MacSwiney of Cork. The Cork Men's Association, marching down Fifth Avenue to the cathedral, caught sight of the British flag on the Union Club, and walked over to the west curb so as not to pass under it. Word was carried to the club that the "Irish want the flag down." The paraders entered the church, but a few moments later a group of men and women suddenly came out of the church and dashed over to the club entrance and shouted "Take down that British flag or we'll pull it down" and "We'll give you five minutes to take in that British flag." They were met by the doorman and other employees of the club. They forced their

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, October 23, 1920

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

way inside the main doorway but could not reach the stairs, and finally with the aid of two or three policemen were forced out of the club house. The manager of the club, unable to find any member of the club committee, decided to take in the Union Jack and the French flag, but the vice-president of the club and other committee members as soon as they knew of his act immediately ordered the flags displayed again. About one o'clock the mass was over and great numbers of men and women who had attended picked up stones and other missiles from some barrels in front of the cathedral where some construction work was going on and began to hurl them at the windows of the Club. Nearly every plate glass window on the Fifth Avenue and Fifty-first Street side on the ground floor and basement were broken.

Probably five thousand took part in the riot. It lasted two hours, and it was not until three o'clock that the mounted police succeeded in driving the crowd off Fifth Avenue. It took two hours more to move the mob halfway down the block. About two hundred police were called out.

So serious was the outrage that sixty Catholic laymen printed the following public protest:

As Americans and Catholics we protest against the infusion of politics into our beloved church. It is particularly deplorable that an outrage upon American liberty should have taken place upon our National day of thanksgiving and coming as it did from a mob of people who had just attended mass at the Cathedral. In order to remove any doubt as to our condemna-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

tion of this un-American proceeding, we are sending a copy of this communication to the press.²⁰

Members of the American Sinn Fein actually threatened to break up the New York Memorial Day parade in 1921 if the British flag, the flag of our late ally, was carried. Although it cannot be told what effect this impudent threat had, it is not unfair to note that the British flag was not carried in that parade, though it has been carried in later Memorial Day parades in New York since the Irish settlement was made.

One of the most humiliating exhibitions of the refusal of fair play was evidenced in the treatment of Sir Philip Gibbs. Some of us may feel that in assessing complicated political situations, his sympathies and emotions sometimes warp his political judgment. But there can be no difference of fair opinion with regard to his magnificent fairness, his sense of justice, his intrinsic sportsmanship. In 1921 he made a tour of American cities, speaking on the Irish question. If anything, he was more than fair to the Sinn Fein cause. As an Englishman, he could not forget that the Sinn Fein had struck England in the back in behalf of a militaristic despotism, when she was fighting for her life. As a sportsman he could not ignore the fact that the Sinn Fein fought without uniforms, heedless of the rules of organized warfare. But he was frank and manly in criticism of British blunders and spoke with fine restraint and generosity. Yet he was heckled, insulted, jeered and shouted at,

²⁰ *Ibid.*, November 28, 1920.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

but never down, in city after city where he spoke. In New York City he spoke in Carnegie Hall on February 27, 1921. The *New York Times*' account stated:

During the hour and a half, there was not a five minutes that was not punctuated by the yells and boos. The audience was divided in its sympathies but the largest part frequently cried out angrily at the men and women who shrieked denunciation in the name of Ireland.²¹

Two weeks later he spoke again at the Casino Theater and was howled at repeatedly by men and women who called him a propagandist.

I attended the meeting at which he spoke in Chicago at the Auditorium Theater. His experiences in other cities were by that time well-known, but when he appeared on the platform and was generously applauded, I felt that the evening would be as quiet as it began. He began quietly and in about the third sentence mentioned the name of Lloyd George. At once bedlam broke loose. Men and women jumped up all over the balcony and gallery, yelling, literally shrieking, "To hell with Lloyd George. To hell with Lloyd George." The uproar continued for fifteen or twenty minutes. Then in a moment of lull he began again. He said that the Irish have long memories, longer than the English. "I remember that a few years before the war, I was in a little town in southern Ireland and saw on the walls of the inn, the words scrawled, 'To hell with King William.'

²¹ *Ibid.*, February 28, 1921.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Now I didn't know that King William had ever been in Ireland." But he got no further. Twenty or thirty persons had jumped up all over the hall, shrieking like madmen and madwomen: "To hell with King William. To hell with King William." There were Ulster Irish in the hall and a dozen fights took place between the two factions. Every time Sir Philip moved to speak the screams and shrieks redoubled in fury. During an hour and fifteen minutes, the police ejected twenty or thirty men. At last, at 9:45, one hour and fifteen minutes after he began his speech, he got under way.

When the news of the Irish Free State settlement was received in our country, the comments of Senators and Congressmen clearly showed great relief. They felt that a problem of American politics had been solved. Senator Walsh of Montana said: "It is almost as fine a thing for our own country as it is for the people of England and Ireland." Senator France of Maryland said: "The splendid news is not only gratifying to the friends of Ireland in this country, but to all good Americans who have had reason to fear that the Irish question might ultimately lead to serious friction between Great Britain and our own country."

"The news from London," said Senator King of Utah, "is unquestionably welcome to the people of the United States. The long controversy has been a disturbing element in our relations with Great Britain and now that England and Ireland are united in peace and amity, undoubtedly the bonds of friend-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

ship between the British and American peoples will be strengthened. It is impossible to overstate the importance of the settlement of the Irish question." ²²

Here were frank acknowledgments that because a large group of our population retained its native prejudices in this country, the settlement of an internal dispute in the British Empire would have a good effect on our relations with Great Britain and on our internal politics.

The problem had indeed been a serious one for our internal politics. Our traditional American good humor, our healthy indulgence of the whims of sections of our population, cannot obscure the fact that the Sinn Fein propaganda grievously threatened our peace and our very safety. The usual American attitude of amusement at what is considered a sort of lunatic fringe of harmless potentialities is not justified by the facts. I do not condemn the sympathy of Americans of Irish descent with the struggles of the people of their old country. But the Sinn Feiners in America went beyond natural expressions of sympathy. They placed our party politics in turmoil for three years, they denied fair play, free speech and diverted our politics to alien ends. But above all, they did their best to bring about war with England. They got resolutions of sympathy through Congress, they got resolutions of actual recognition through state conventions and legislatures, and only the greatest effort prevented them getting resolutions for recognition through Congress and into the national

²² *Ibid.*, December 8, 1921.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

party platform. If a resolution of recognition had been passed through Congress, it would have been a declaration of war. Such a war, if it had come so soon after the World War, involving two great nations, one heavily drained and one deeply involved in the World War, would have meant, as Sir Philip Gibbs so eloquently warned us, a fearful conflict which would have entailed the end of western civilization.

But we are told that the Irish question is settled and this question forever removed from our politics. So we were told in 1922, just after the peace agreement was published. As Lord Balfour humorously but grimly reminded us, when he was told that American sentiment towards Britain had greatly improved because of two events, the settlement of the British debt and the settlement of the Irish question, it takes a great deal of optimism to think that the Irish question is ever settled.

In 1922 the Sinn Fein issue broke loose in the Massachusetts Democratic Senatorial primary. William A. Gaston, a prominent Boston lawyer and banker, Sherman L. Whipple, one of the leading lawyers of the United States, and former State Senator John J. Walsh, were candidates for the Democratic nomination for United States Senator. A dispatch to the *Chicago Tribune*, describing the bitter campaign that developed, referred to the fact that the Democratic party in Massachusetts

is so preponderantly Irish that it has become the custom to

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

speak of the Irish Democrats and the Yankee Democrats. . . . Because the Irish repeatedly have plumped almost solidly for every Irish name on a Democratic primary ticket the Republican leaders are expecting the nomination of Walsh, particularly with the Yankees split between Whipple and Gaston.

But the article went on to explain that there was some Irish opposition to Walsh as Mayor Curley of Boston was opposed to him. It said:

With a view to weakening Walsh among the Sinn Fein Irish his opposition is making much of his obstruction of a resolution in the state senate to invite De Valera to address that body. Walsh replies that the resolution he opposed was one inviting 'President de Valera of the Irish republic,' which, he said, would have placed the Massachusetts senate in the position of recognizing the Irish republic in defiance of the attitude of the federal government. He had no objection to inviting 'Mr. de Valera.' This issue was raised against him unsuccessfully in the 1920 campaign.²³

Indeed, agitation on behalf of the Irish Republic, though on a greatly reduced scale, has continued ever since the settlement. Probably the great majority of our people of Irish origin were, if not satisfied with the settlement, at least willing to let the matter drop there. But a minority and not a negligible one continued the contest with great bitterness.

Shortly after the settlement was announced, the Friends of Irish Freedom announced that they would continue to combat English propaganda in this country and to aid the people of Ireland in their struggle for real independence. At a meeting at the

²³ *Chicago Tribune*, August 23, 1922.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Hotel Astor \$3,000,000 was pledged for the cause. One speaker declared: "There will be peace in Ireland, but there will be no Irish peace in America." At a Clan-na-Gael meeting in New York City shortly after the death of Arthur Griffiths, his name was hissed. On November 26, 1922, a meeting was held in the Earl Carroll Theater which overflowed into the street. The *New York Times*' account reads in part: "The row started early, because by seven o'clock the theater was jammed to the doors and the firemen stationed there had the entrances barred. Deputation after deputation from councils of Irish organizations continued to arrive in front of the theater, however, and with their banners and placards jammed Seventh Avenue and Fiftieth Street. . . ." They started an overflow meeting, and "then the Donnybrook began." The police attempted to stop the overflow meeting and a wild riot ensued. "By this time, at least 3000 persons were fighting and raging up and down in Seventh Avenue and in Fiftieth Street while over on Broadway, a crowd of night strollers stopped to watch the battle but were restrained by the police from venturing nearer." In the end the police gave up the fight. "After a half hour's battle, the police, their uniforms torn and their faces scratched by furious women gave up the attempt to disperse the crowd and became spectators. . . . Banners were smashed over policemen's heads, clubs snatched from their hands and used against them, women screamed and clawed at them, an effigy of King George was burned, somebody turned in the

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

fire alarm and when the firemen arrived, the crowd turned on them." ²⁴

On October 5, 1923, when Lloyd George came on a visit to this country, as he left the theater in New York a gang of disturbers, who had carried banners through the streets blaming him for Ireland's woes, threw rotten eggs at him. On November 2, 1923, two hundred and fifty men and women marched through the streets in front of the Metropolitan Opera House, carrying banners bearing pictures of de Valera and references to the Black and Tans. The paraders pummeled the police with canes and the banners, but were finally dispersed without causing any disturbance to Lloyd George himself.

In New York City a quarrel arose between the Free State and the Republic for the possession of a consular office. On January 2, 1923, some fifty or more Republicans besieged the consular office in which the Free State representative was installed. The police forced out the intruders and then had to clear the rooms. ²⁵

On May 20, 1924, a plea was made in Congress for a resolution requesting the release of Eamon de Valera and his colleagues, then imprisoned in Ireland for political offenses. The *New York Times* dispatch stated that, "A few days before his death Charles F. Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall, wrote letters to the Democratic members of the House from New York urging them to intercede on de Valera's behalf." Mr. Boylan was among those who heard

²⁴ *New York Times*, November 27, 1922.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, January 3, 1923.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

from Mr. Murphy on the subject. Mr. Boylan said: "De Valera and his colleagues are State prisoners. They have been confined nearly a year without any charge being lodged against them. They are not criminals. They look to our great Republic to intervene and help them in their hour of necessity." ²⁶

On June 2, 1925, General O'Duffy, head of the Irish Free State police, came to New York and was greeted by a "barrage of eggs, accompanied by hissing and cries of 'Shame,' 'Traitor,' and 'He's a second Benedict Arnold.' Twenty women, kicking and screaming, were ejected from the armory by two hundred military police and detectives." ²⁷

In September, 1925, General Richard Mulcahy, Commander of the Military Forces of the Irish Free State, was attacked by mobs of Republican sympathizers both in New York and in Philadelphia. In New York a crowd of about one hundred, mostly composed of women, met him on the pier, pelted him with rotten eggs and tomatoes, pummeled him, shouting, "Black and Tans." They carried banners inscribed: "Mulcahy, murderer of 77," "George Washington and Eamon de Valera, Benedict Arnold and Richard Mulcahy," "Mulcahy, murderer; Mulcahy, traitor; Mulcahy, perjurer." ²⁸

These incidents are sufficient, I think, to prove that the alien cast of mind which we saw in such force in the Sinn Fein propaganda of 1920 and 1921 still exists, and that a crisis is only needed in Ireland to make it a dominant force in our politics again.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, May 21, 1924. ²⁷ *Ibid.*, June 3, 1925 ²⁸ *Ibid.*, September 18, 1925.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

It is this alien cast of mind, this foreign background, which, of course, is the crux of the whole matter. So long as that remains, so long will it determine the course of opinion on any political question that comes up into which it may find lodging.

I have tried to present the evidence of alien thinking and alien based action on the part of large sections of our populations of German and Irish origin on the question of our part in the World War, and the recognition of the Irish Republic, with as little comment as possible. Much of the evidence has been in the words of the very men of Irish and German descent whose actions are under consideration. By all this I imply nothing as to the individual worth or loveliness of our people of Irish or German origin. My own boyhood and manhood have been enriched by friendship with many of both groups. The wholesome and "gemütlich" German population has taught us much in its love of music, of gymnastics, of the simple pleasures of easy-going social life which the more dour Anglo-Saxon had neglected or forgotten. And who is there who has not an affection for the kindly, exuberant and warm-hearted Irishman of the South? Great numbers of our people of Irish and German blood, where they have not remained in racial groups but have spread out into the country, no longer have an alien background and have become indistinguishable elements of our population. Particularly is this the case where they have intermarried with the native stock or with other immigrant groups. They have furnished us many

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

distinguished leaders of our business and professional life and a substantial part of our best citizenry. But I only maintain that the facts of alien thinking and action cited in this book are true, that they are not sporadic but represent a general and dangerous condition. Large numbers of both these immigrant stocks have remained and constitute today, especially in the great cities, separate, self-conscious, racial groups. Their members have remained German-Americans or Irish-Americans. They have not become, as so many of their kind have become, Americans of Irish or German descent. They still think with an alien background. They are still clannish, they wish to control our politics for the ends of their native lands. And we shall see that even when our questions do not directly concern their native lands, their ancestral bias is so strong that they instinctively decide our foreign politics with reference to their own alien biases. We shall consider the evidence of this in connection with other races whose prejudices are involved in those same questions.

Yet the Irish and the Germans are our two oldest races of other than the dominant British stock. The Irish first began coming in large numbers in 1844, the Germans in 1848. Eighty years have gone by and yet the alien reaction persists.

CHAPTER X

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT— ALIEN GROUPS IN POST-WAR POLITICS

1. THE NEWER ALIEN GROUPS

WHAT then can we expect of the newer racial elements which, particularly since 1890, have poured in on us? They are far more alien to us than the Irish and the Germans. They are more backward races than those of North Europe. Moreover, it must be realized that they are new to America. The immigrant when he first comes to America is submerged—he is absorbed in making a living. He is not able to work our politics to his ends. It is only as he increases in knowledge and wealth and obtains leisure that he is able to make himself a factor in our politics. The full force of the Italian, the Greek, the Czecho-Slovak and the Yugoslav will not be felt for a generation to come. Yet the same organized group forces are at work with our newer immigrants. These newer alien groups all have their newspapers, their organized societies, and they are jealous of any action which affects their native countries. As an instance of the kind of alien group action which is going on, it may be noted that in 1922 the Italian ambassador in a tour of Italian centers in the United States actually urged Italians to become naturalized

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

"so that they can vote and cast their ballots unitedly to protect Italian interests."¹

Mussolini appears, moreover, to hold some of the pre-war German theory of retaining the loyalty of his people wherever they go. His slogan is "Once an Italian always an Italian to the seventh generation."² Dean Wigmore of Northwestern University quotes a press dispatch from Washington of December 23, 1926: "The dictator plans to retain a firm hold on Italians in other parts of the world, particularly in the two Americas. Mail balloting for the Italian resident in a foreign country will be resorted to, only if it is impossible to arrange with the particular country for the location of balloting places and Italian election commissioners."³

We shall see how strongly the South Europeans have already begun to influence our politics. It showed up in the League of Nations debate, in the Four Power Treaty, in the war debts, in the debate on immigration restriction itself, and it is a powerful factor in the discussion of the World Court. Let us take up some of these questions and see how the ramifications of alien thinking and action go into every field of our politics, not merely questions which directly concern the nation from which an alien group comes, but those where it is not directly involved and yet where the prejudices derived from ancestral relations determine the decision of an American question. In the evidence on these questions there will be

¹ *New York Times*, April 22, 1922.

² *Illinois Law Review*, April, 1927, p. 761.

³ *Ibid.*

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

instances of German and Irish thinking and action, which I shall treat here as part of our general question of hyphenated thinking, apart from the special questions of our entrance into the war and that of the Irish Republic.

2. ALIEN GROUPS AND THE LEAGUE

What is said here on alien groups and the League in no way depends on approval or disapproval of the League. I was myself, and am still, a strong opponent of Article X, not because it involved entanglement in European politics, for we have long since been, are to-day and always must be involved in European politics, but because Article X stated a purpose to keep the boundaries of the world static. But the League of Nations was clearly entitled to get a decision of our people on the basis of American principles, or at least American prejudices, and not on alien group prejudices. It did not get such a decision. German-Americans opposed the League because it was part of the hated Versailles Treaty. Irish-Americans opposed it partly because they believed that it would be used to preserve the internal status quo of the members of the League whereas Article X had reference only to the preservation of boundaries from external aggression. But largely they opposed it because England was in it.

At a great mass meeting in Chicago in September, 1919, under the auspices of the Friends of Irish Freedom, former Governor Dunne deplored the League as unfair to Ireland. He called the treaty "an in-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

sult," and a "brace game" and declared that America must not gamble away "its security and perpetuity." He said that Ireland would never be able to free herself by rebellion but declared that the adoption of the covenant of the League "would doom that nation's aims." Father F. X. McCabe, also speaking at this meeting, asked that the League and the Covenant be banished as unholy.⁴

At a hearing on August 30, 1919, before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Dunne, according to the newspaper report, "drew an impressive picture of conditions in Ireland under British rule, and told the Committee the United States under Article X would perpetuate this situation." Judge Cohalan declared: "We ask for the extension of liberty, not of autocracy, and we urge that no League of Nations which so vitally affects the sovereignty of America and which leaves the people of Ireland in the possession of the governing class of England, can be right or can make for a just and permanent peace." He asserted that conditions in Ireland were deplorable, and added: "By Article X of the proposed treaty, now under consideration by the Senate, the American Republic is asked to perpetuate this character of government in the Twentieth Century and to assist the British government to maintain the same." Mr. Bourke Cockran declared: "All the Leagues of Nations on earth won't keep Ireland submissive to the wrongs done her—thank God for it."⁵ He said that to ratify the treaty would

⁴ *Chicago Tribune*, September 15, 1919.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

be treason. When the Chicago delegates returned from Washington they rejoiced: "We have killed the League of Nations." We have seen how the Senate loaded its assent to the Covenant with a reservation as to Ireland.

In the conferences at the Peace Table in Paris, the aspirations of the newer racial groups in our country became involved and their organized efforts were soon displayed in our politics. On May 17, 1920, the Senate passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate, that Northern Epirus (including Coritza), the twelve islands of the Ægean and the Western coast of Asia Minor where a strong Greek population predominates should be awarded by the Peace Conference to Greece and become incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece.⁶

On January 21, 1920, the Senate adopted a resolution stating:

That it is the sense of the Senate that those parts of Thrace which have been surrendered by Bulgaria and Turkey to the principal Allied and Associated powers and which according to the showing made by Greece, are ethnologically and historically Greek and strategically important to Greece shall be awarded by the Peace Conference to Greece and become incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece, Greece being charged with the duty of granting to Bulgaria arrangements for the accommodation of Bulgarian commerce at an Ægean port of a similar character to the accommodations granted Serbia at Saloniki.⁷

⁶ *Ibid.*, August 31, 1919.

⁷ Congressional Record, May 17, 1920.

⁷ *Ibid.*, January 21, 1920.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Senator Borah declared, it is true, that the matter was none of our business but added that "it is not my intention to oppose it." The resolution was agreed to without a vote.

During the campaign, President Harding wrote a letter to a Greek society stating:

You may be assured that I will strive to do my just part to further the righteous cause of the Greek nation and the splendid element of citizenship it has contributed to this country. I will continue to help in every possible way, as I have done in the Senate in the last two years. I voted for the Lodge resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that Northern Epirus, including Coritza, twelve islands of the Ægean and the western coast of Asia Minor should be incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece. I stand for a settlement which will do full justice to the Greek people.⁸

In the campaign of 1920, the Republican National Committee actually issued literature on both sides of the Fiume question. It was a temptation too strong for politicians catering to alien votes to resist. They issued pamphlets to the Yugoslavs telling them that Harding favored their contentions. They issued literature to the Italians telling them that Harding favored the Italian claims.

The Italian pamphlet stated:

For us of Italian origin, animated by one united faith in the grandeur of Italy, Fiume is not a mere name but a pledge, a symbol of the triumph of Italian right over international aggression. Well, the Democratic candidate to the categorical demand of Harding to express his view concerning the question

⁸ Quoted in *New York Times*, September 27, 1921.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

of the Adriatic, which includes Fiume, has maintained an eloquent silence—for him Wilson has spoken too much.

But Harding has already demonstrated his sympathy for Italy. To him Italian-Americans will demonstrate their faith by voting for him.

Yes. By the martyrdom of her soldiers, by the triumph of Justice, by the official recognition of the Italianism of Fiume and of Dalmatia, it will vote its sympathy for Harding. Bring defeat to the Democratic Party.

The pamphlet to the Yugoslavs actually attacked the Democratic administration for bringing us into the World War. "By joining this war," it said, "the Democratic administration not only lowered the actual values of the currency but gave opportunity to dishonest officials to acquire money out of public funds." But then it directly advised Yugoslavs to vote for Harding on the Fiume question.

The League of Nations is not only unjust and powerless in upholding peace, but it is also anti-American. In the Council of the League England has six votes while the United States has only one. Such a League would form a kind of supreme rule over the entire world, and of course would be under the control of European diplomats and politicians.

Did the League of Nations solve the Adriatic problem? Can it solve it? Would it solve it justly?

The voice of Italy and her political and military influence and power will always stand against the just demands of Yugoslavia. The good feeling, friendship and political cooperation of Italy will always be worth more in the eyes of England and France than the just demands of the Yugo-Slavs.

All of the above will convince you why you should vote for the Republican Party in the coming elections.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

3. ALIEN GROUPS AND THE FOUR POWER TREATY, THE WORLD COURT AND THE QUOTA LAWS

The Friends of Irish Freedom, and all the other organizations which oppose anything which England favors, also opposed the Four Power Treaty concluded with England, Japan and France in 1921.

The World Court from the beginning has been subject to incessant campaign by the foreign groups. The various Irish organizations have never wearied in their opposition from the time President Harding first declared for it. The Steuben Society adopted a resolution stating that the same reasons should keep us out of the World Court as "kept America from signing the Treaty of Versailles and that kept America out of the League of Nations." *The Irish World*, *The Gaelic American* and *The Irish Republic of Chicago* have been full of the most bitter attacks on the World Court as a device of English deviltry. *The Irish Republic of Chicago*, published by the Illinois Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, appeared on February 6, 1926, the first issue after the Senate adopted the World Court resolution, with a black bordered square on its editorial page:

In Memoriam

Born July 4, 1776

Died Jan. 27, 1926

This Tablet is Erected Here in the National Cemetery in
Sorrowful Remembrance of our Surrendered Sovereignty

In the New York *Gaelic American* of January 30,

[295]

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

1926, was printed a resolution of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Massachusetts which is a fair sample of tons of similar literature:

.
Whereas, This propaganda in favor of a World Court is the same that seeks to pervert American history in our schools, that libels the patriotic heroes of Revolutionary memory; that denounces our Senators and Representatives who stand for American principles; that declares the Star Spangled Banner a vile song; that would bribe American youth with English scholarships and purchase penniless college professors with annuities; that subsidizes the Tory press in this country; that has desecrated the pulpit with the rancorous spirit of paid zealots; that has suppressed the public exhibition of 'The Spirit of '76' film; that favored the League of Nations and purchased the Sulgrave Manor that Americans might not forget that George Washington was of English ancestry. . . .

Resolved, That we do condemn, specifically and particularly the Cecil Rhodes and Andrew Carnegie Foundations, that openly and secretly aim at the reconquest of the United States of America as a part of a re-united British-American Empire and call upon the present national administration to take such action against the same as will cause these de-nationalization activities to cease and compel the withdrawal of their forces from our political, economic and industrial life.

.
Perhaps it may not seem fair to instance the activity of the newer alien groups in opposition to the quota laws as based, as an example of alien bias in our politics. It may be said that it were rude indeed to deny the Italians, the Greeks and the Slavs the

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

right of self-protection. But they have no right of self-protection save as Americans. They are supposed to be, they vehemently insist that they are, Americans. There are native reasons for opposing the quota laws, and plenty of native Americans do oppose them. But the alien groups opposed them as alien groups, for alien reasons, and they threatened reprisal through the power of their group votes.

A newspaper dispatch of March 14, 1924, stated:

The deuce of the thing, as a member put it, is that the immigration measure has come to plague all party men in a presidential year. Seemingly if the thing could be put off until next winter, the Johnson bill, drastic as it is, would go through both houses without trouble. Now both parties are afraid of losing votes in the presidential election if their representatives and senators shall vote a virtually 'keep-out' clause into the immigration bill.

Charges have been made directly in the lower House of Congress that 'foreign blocs' in the American legislative chamber are working against the interests of the country. Of course the retort has been made that the foreign blocs are really truly American blocs because as their spokesmen put it, they stand for that which America is supposed to stand, the making of this land a home for the oppressed everywhere. Of course this is old stuff, but it has a certain kind of sob in it which appeals to sentimentalists.

It has more than a sob in it; it has a threat in it. The New York delegation virtually solidly is opposed to the Johnson bill for restrictive immigration. Delegates from other northern states having big cities within their borders are almost solidly opposed to the Johnson bill as it has been drawn. It isn't necessary to explain the reason for the opposition. Members

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

who represent the big city districts know that if the naturalized foreigners in their bailiwicks vote solidly against them, they can't come back to Washington as members of the sixty-ninth Congress. . . .⁹

The *Saturday Evening Post* of April 5, 1924, reprinted the following from a recent issue of the Congressional Record:

THEY WANT UNRESTRICTED IMMIGRATION

The following is reprinted from a recent issue of the Congressional Record:

'Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I also present telegrams, letters, and resolutions from the following organizations in the State of Massachusetts opposing the so-called Johnson immigration bill restricting immigration, which I request be referred to the Immigration Committee:

'The Association for Protest Against Restricted Immigration, of Pittsfield; Board of Aldermen, of Malden; City Council, of Lawrence; City Council, of Revere; Board of Aldermen, of Chelsea; Board of directors of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce, of Chelsea; City Council and mayor of Fitchburg; Eliot School Association, of Boston; American Citizens of Polish Descent of Fall River; Young Men's Hebrew Association, of Fitchburg; League of Jewish Women's Organizations, of Boston; Group 398, Polish National Alliance, of Boston; Congregation Sons of Abraham, of Worcester; The Associated Jewish Organizations of Massachusetts, of Boston; Committee of Polish-American Citizens of Webster; Polish Citizens of Northampton; Associated Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations of New England, of Fall River; Young Men's Hebrew Association, of Fall River; Polish-American Citizens' Club, of Adams; Young Women's Hebrew Associa-

⁹ Chicago *Evening Post*, March 14, 1924.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

tion, of Lawrence; Polish Student's Club, of Boston; Associated Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations of New England, of Boston; Bethel Israel Synagogue, of Malden; Citizens of Polish Extraction, of Worcester; North Adams Chapter of Hadassah, of North Adams; District Six of the Associated Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations of New England, of Woonsocket, R. I.; Young Women's Hebrew Association, of Fall River; Polish-American Citizens' Club, of Lowell; American Citizens of Polish Birth, of Boston; Polish Citizens' Club, of Chicopee; Polish Uhlans' Society, of Chicopee; All United Polish Citizen Clubs, of Chicopee; Jewish Organizations of Holyoke; Board of Aldermen and the mayor of the city of Beverly; Sons of Calabrisa Mutual Aid Society, of North Adams; Lodge Trinacria Order of Sons of Italy, of Lawrence; St. Anthony Society, of Dedham; Lodge 847, Sons of Italy, of Southbridge; Società Maritima Madonna, of Boston; Society Pedarese, of Lawrence; Congregation Beth Israel, of Cambridge; Roslindale Lodge 1057, Sons of Italy in America, of Roslindale; Lodge Sogno D'Italia, of Belmont; Columbus Club, of Fall River; Lodge Vittorio Venelo 1035, Sons of Italy, of Fall River; Italian Citizens' Club of Massachusetts, of Fall River; Progressive Club, of Fall River; Society Trecastagnese of St. Alfio, of Lawrence; Loggia Cesare Battisti 632, O. F. D. Italian in America, of East Boston; Sicilian-American Citizens' Club, of Lawrence; Sivitalliano Benefit Society, of Worcester; First Bankers' Union (Inc.), of Boston; Sons of Italy, No. 1088, of South Barre; St. Annas Society, of South Barre; Italian Social Club, of South Barre; United Lodges, Sons of Italy, of Lynn; Lodge Archimede, No. 1042, Sons of Italy, of Lawrence; Order Daughters of Italy in America, of Everett; Society Basilicata, of Lawrence; Loggia Principedi 1045, of Dedham; Lodge Vitruva Romano, Order Sons of Italy in America, of Salem; New Century Club, of Boston; Lodge I. U. 904, Sons of Italy in America, of Attleboro;

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Sons of Italy, of Lowell; Lodge Italia Order Sons of Italy in America, of Cambridge; Congregation Agidath Israel, of Lynn; The Tuscany Mutual Benefit Society of Boston; Lodge Italia 506, Sons of Italy in America, of Cambridge; Italian-American Improvement Club, of Chelsea; Loggia Dante Alighieri, No. 309, of Lawrence; The Ligurian Auxiliary, of Boston; Lowell Lodge, No. 874, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Lowell; Association Nazionale Combattenti Italiani, of Lawrence; The Mazzini Club, of Boston; Italian American Naturalization Club, of Leominster; Order of Sons of Italy, of Fitchburg; Jewish National Workers' Alliance of America, of Fall River; Loggia Gabriele D'Annunzio, No. 592, Order of Sons of Italy in America, of Beverly; Sons of Italy Lodge Piave Fiume, of Watertown; Independent Order B'nai B'rith, Fall River Lodge, No. 884, Fall River; and Italian Central Committee of Revere.'

The vote on the two quota laws was most significant. On the first quota law of 1921 the vote in the House was 296 to 42. Of the 42, 33 were from the six states of New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Massachusetts.

On the bill of 1924 the vote was 323 to 71. Of the 71, 55 were from the above six states.

Congressman Celler of New York, who voted against the bill, received a letter from Prince Gelasio Caetani, the Italian ambassador, congratulating him on his speech in the House in opposition to the bill, and thanking him especially "for the frank and open position you have taken in upholding the dignity of my race."¹⁰ Imagine the furore if the British ambassador had taken similar action. Lord Sackville West was sent home merely because, in response to

¹⁰ *New York Times*, May 13, 1924.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

a request from a supposed British-born voter, he advised him how to vote.

The recent onslaught by alien blocs on the national origins provision is the latest demonstration of alien bias in our politics. The national origins provision would allow immigration from Germany of 23,428 instead of 51,227 under the 1890 basis, and from the Irish Free State 13,862 instead of 23,428. The press representing those two groups was filled with bitter attacks on the national origins basis, and the German and Irish societies conducted a bitter campaign against the plan.

The attacks on Captain Trevor, who prepared the tentative national origins estimates, are a sample of the alien propaganda of vilification and misrepresentation, poured on any representative of the native stock who opposes the desires of our organized alien blocs. He stated before the House Committee that it "has been alleged that I was in the pay of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, that I was a traitor to my country, that I was a naturalized subject recently in the British service and working to bring about a reunion between the United States and Great Britain."¹¹

Both Irish and German blocs claim that the Census Bureau's study of the 1790 census does not give full effect to their nationalities. But while both ridicule the 1790 census basis, both offer in their own

¹¹ Hearings, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, January 18, 19 and 26, 1927, p. 26.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

behalf little but self-serving claims by German and Irish historians. Their contentions will be taken up in Chapter XII where the origins provision is discussed. At this point their claims are pertinent only to show the intrinsically alien bias of their psychology. The conclusion is unavoidable that a large part of the trouble is due to an injury to their racial complexes. Some of the Irish politicians and newspapers have the amiable habit of claiming everything for their race. It is fully to be expected that they will claim that Washington, Lincoln and Franklin came from County Cork. They are not willing to admit that the Revolutionary War must have been largely fought by men of English descent, as it necessarily was on account of the content of the population at that time. By this I imply absolutely no discredit of the services at any time in our history by men of Irish, German, Swedish or any other race, but there is a mass of evidence in the claims of almost all our alien blocs that they continually and contemptuously belittle the contributions of our English-Scotch stock. It is this alien bias which, I am convinced, is largely at the root of their bitter opposition to the origins basis. It is not unfair to say that the real cause of their protest against the origins basis is simply that under the 1890 basis Germany and Ireland would get more than twice and Great Britain and North Ireland less than half of the immigration they would get under the origins basis. The anti-English racial prejudice is severely rasped. Both groups are satisfied with the 1890 basis, which

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

is an arbitrary discrimination in favor of Germany and Ireland and against the native stock and the Southeastern European. The Irish- and German-Americans have not nearly so much reason to protest against the origins basis as the South Europeans and the native stock have to object to the 1890 basis.

The significant fact is that both groups brought their forces to bear against the origin principle as alien groups with all the old political threat. As a sample of the kind of propaganda that is going on, it is worth noting that I wrote to the Steuben Society for some copies of its magazine, *The Progressive*, and received not only the copies of the magazine but 147 sealed envelopes under the frank of a United States Senator, ready to be addressed, each containing a copy of an excerpt from the Congressional Record reprinting an article from the Steuben Society's magazine, *The Progressive*. In other words, the Steuben Society is sending out its propaganda under the frank of a United States Senator.

A witness of German descent protested before the House Committee at its hearing in January, 1927, on the origins plan that the origins plan "is a discrimination that works powerfully in favor of Great Britain and it looks very much like our statesmen are trying to Anglicize America. . . . Those with whom I have talked are of the opinion that you would finally turn this country over to be a colony of Great Britain."

In an appeal published in the Steuben Society's magazine, *The Progressive*, for February 15, 1927,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

one writer holds that the origins provision "can be accounted for only on the theory of pernicious, nativistic influences. . . ." At a meeting of this Society on February 15, 1927, in New York City, the claim was heatedly made that the origins provision discriminates against people of German birth or descendants. One speaker cried: "To my dying day, I will protest against insidious propaganda that would turn this country into a British principality and put a British viceroy in power in the United States."

Fifty percent of our population originated in Great Britain and North Ireland and yet we are not a colony of Great Britain, but to receive fifty percent of our immigration from Great Britain and North Ireland puts us, it would seem, in dire danger of becoming such a colony.

These attacks on the origins basis show clearly that the moving force is an alien group psychology.

The alien blocs are well organized and brought their pressure immediately to bear at the last session of Congress. Congress was much perturbed by the outbreak. The Senate voted unanimously to postpone the whole question for a year with evident relief. The House debate was vigorous and there was strong opposition to delay. Strong speeches for the origins provision were made by Congressmen Vaile and Box, both of which showed a strong sense of our danger from alien bloc thinking. But the desire to postpone the question was held even by many men who favored the origins provision, and by a vote of

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

233 to 111 the House likewise agreed to postpone the effective date one year.

Powerful party pressure was brought in favor of outright repeal of the origins provision. One prominent Republican leader bluntly declared that the origins provision offended the Irish and German groups who were politically powerful, and its repeal would offend only the stock of English descent which was politically impotent.

4. FASCISM IN AMERICA

The Italian-Americans have recently shown many manifestations of the same turbulent desire to fight their Italian quarrels on our soil that the Irish have long shown. The Fascisti régime has stimulated much ill-feeling in this country. On June 6, 1924, twenty-five hundred Italians in Carnegie Hall, New York, demanded that the Italian ambassador be sent back to Italy and that the United States refuse to receive any ambassador from Italy until Mussolini retires from power. The *New York Times*, report of the meeting said:

A police detail from the West Forty-seventh Street Station, augmented by Sergeants Brown and Gegan and the full strength of the bomb squad from Police Headquarters had difficulty restraining the throng and stopping the battles between members of rival factions. Reserves from the West Forty-Seventh Street Station under Captain Kelleher were rushed to the hall.

Mention of Mussolini and the Fascisti brought yells, boos and hisses from all sections of the hall. . . . At one stage it seemed as if serious injuries would result from a series of fist

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

fight that began in the rear of the auditorium. Police were kept busy separating persons of opposite political factions and were compelled to rescue Fort Velona of 535 Morris Avenue, the Bronx from an angry group.

The resolution demanding the recall of Prince Gelasio Caetani, Italian ambassador, was presented by Charles Ervin, former editor of the *Call*. It was passed unanimously and copies were to be sent to President Coolidge and Secretary of State Hughes.¹²

When nine delegates from Italy to the Interparliamentary Conference in Washington arrived in New York on September 21, 1925, there were three distinct riots by anti-Fascisti Italians. Valentino's body was withdrawn from public view because of clashes between Fascisti and anti-Fascisti Italians in the streets near the funeral rooms.

At a meeting on January 23, 1927, in New York, Professor Gaetano Salvemini, speaking against Mussolini, was so heckled by Fascisti sympathizers that he could not proceed until over fifty persons had been ejected from the hall.¹³

On January 17, 1927 an anti-Fascisti bomb was thrown at the Italian Consulate in New York, a street riot occurred on Palm Sunday, 1927, in Paterson, New Jersey, between Fascisti and anti-Fascisti.

These troubles do not disturb us greatly, it is true, but they clearly indicate the existence of a totally alien content of mind which, on some subject which

¹² *New York Times*, June 27, 1924.

¹³ *Ibid*, January 24, 1927.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

does concern us, instinctively acts in American affairs for foreign reasons.

5. THE WAR DEBTS

I realize that many persons will seriously object to the foreign debt question as an example of the action of alien bias on our political thought. It is difficult to put one's finger on it, and yet I believe that no fair-minded person can doubt it. The bitterness with which the British settlement was pursued before the agreement was made, the extreme bitterness with which the French have been followed, the fact that France was refused a settlement in the fall of 1925 of over twice what Italy agreed to pay a year later, and the fact that the Italian settlement was made on extremely low terms as compared to the others, all are to a great extent explained by the fact that there is a German and an Irish vote in this country opposed to the British, a German vote opposed to the French, and no French vote in her favor, while there is a large and conscious Italian vote to protect Italy. It protects Italy, at least, from such denunciations by our politicians as are hurled at England and France. It is a significant fact that the Congressmen and politicians who rail at France have treated Italy with the utmost consideration.

Moreover, the debate has been characterized by the same sort of gross misstatement that was spread against France in 1915 and 1916. The statement has been repeated, for instance, over and over again that the French do not pay taxes, until it is believed im-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

plicitly by nine out of ten Americans. It undoubtedly has a German source, for, of course, it is viciously untrue. They pay about 20% of their income in taxes while we pay but 11%. With the same population as ours, their revenue would be about four and one-half billion dollars, whereas our revenue is about three billions and a quarter. In January, 1926, the *Atlantic Monthly* published an article by an adviser to the American Debt Commission, which was supposed to represent the position of the Commission with regard to the settlement of the French debt. It showed throughout a markedly antagonistic attitude towards France. It repeated the baseless charge that the French do not pay taxes.

6. CHICAGO POLITICS

No, there is not a question of foreign politics which comes up that our alien groups do not think on as aliens and markedly distort and warp our opinion. Indeed, the distortion extends into domestic politics. No better example of a skillful player on alien prejudices could be given than William Hale Thompson of Chicago. I think it is a fair observation that his success as a politician, and it is a very great success, has been due more than anything else to the skill with which he plays on the psychology of the foreign voter who in the first or second generation overwhelmingly controls Chicago politics. His testimony before the Court in the first two days of his libel suit against the *Chicago Tribune* shows how consistent his position has been. He opposed our

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

entrance into the war. He was pro-German then and bitterly anti-English. He is the same still. He opposed our sending troops to Europe. He opposed the League of Nations, of course, as the evil result of an evil war. He opposed the Four Power Treaty because England was in it. He opposes the World Court. He has never lost a chance to praise the German voter, and to play on every racial element disgruntled in any way by the World War. He and his supporters have nothing too good to say for the soldiers who they claim were the pawns of the international bankers. In his political circulars he pictures the Chicago newspapers opposed to him, with high hats bearing the British emblem.

In the primary campaign of 1926 Thompson seized on the World Court as an issue wherewith to nominate his county ticket in Cook County. He declared that each ballot for his side was a blow at England. He said: "I helped elect Deneen and I apologize for it. I thought he was an honest man, but he hadn't been in Washington twenty-four hours before the King of England got him."¹⁴

He used the same tactics in his campaign for the Republican nomination for mayor of Chicago in February, 1927. Day after day he drove for the German-American vote.

I want to make the King of England keep his snoot out of America. That's what I want. I don't want the League of Nations. I don't want the World Court. America first—and last—and always. That's the issue of this campaign.

¹⁴ Chicago *Daily News*, April 8, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Again:

Let me tell you something. The only thing they got against Bill Thompson is he don't get up in the morning and sing 'God Save the King' before breakfast.¹⁵

The Chicago *Tribune* of February 20, 1927, two days before the election, summarized the campaign as follows:

The German-American vote has been the recipient of a tremendous amount of attention and direct appeal. Litsinger, by virtue of his ancestry, is reported to have made great headway here. The Thompson camp disputes this heatedly. Many prominent German-Americans are campaigning for Litsinger, but the Crowe-Galpin-Thompson outfit insists the bulk of this vote is for Thompson.

Much mention has been made of the fact that Litsinger changed the spelling of his name during the war, transforming a 'z' into an 's.' Perhaps the most destructive work against Thompson in the German vote is reported to have been done by the letter of Postmaster Arthur Lueder last December assailing Thompson's candidacy as 'an insult to German-Americans.'

Then there is the Swedish-American vote. They dope it at Litsinger headquarters that the Swedes, who have a reputation of being as clannish as the Scotch, are highly incensed because Bill called Fred Lundin, the self-styled poor Swede, 'a rat.' Thousands of them are said to have signed the independent petitions of John Dill Robertson, who is being groomed by Lundin to run after the primaries if such a course will do most damage to Thompson.

Thompson won the nomination by a vote of 342,279 to 162,240.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, February 10, 1927.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

He used the same tactics in the election campaign against Mayor Dever, a Catholic, whose parents were both born in Ireland and who had made an admirable mayor. Thompson made the King of England the center of the attack. He made violent attacks on certain American histories which had been authorized for use in the schools under a system which allows the principals to select the school histories to be used from an authorized list. We will take up the attack on the school histories more particularly in Chapter XI. Here it should be noted that the histories were actually made the issue of the campaign, although the superintendent who sanctioned them was an appointee of the Board of Education and the latter is a continuing appointive board, the terms of the members of which expire at different intervals, not all of whom had been appointed by Mayor Dever. Thompson claimed that the histories were pro-British, that they belittled the justice of the American cause in the Revolution, and that they slighted the aid given by Pulaski, von Steuben, De Kalb, Kosciusko and La Fayette. In one speech he declared, "One of the issues of the mayoralty campaign is whether our taxes shall be spent to make the city's children hate George Washington and love the King." Again, he said "Then when I went out of office, Washington fell out and the King of England fell in."¹⁶ A newspaper statement of March 18, 1927, reads, "Demanding that the names of Kosciusko and Pulaski be put back in the Chicago school

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, March 24, 1927.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

histories, representative Polish leaders in twenty-two wards are perfecting precinct organizations with the objective of 100,000 votes for Thompson, says a statement issued from Republican headquarters."¹⁷

A full-page advertisement published March 30 by the "Business Men's Club Wm. Hale Thompson for Mayor" declared:

We have the Tories with us to-day just as Washington had them when the snows at Valley Forge were stained by the bleeding feet of his ragged soldiers, fighting the battle for human liberty.

It concluded:

Vote for William Hale Thompson for Mayor (and America First). He is a red-blooded American whose forefathers helped rock the Cradle of Liberty. Rid Chicago of these British lackeys—let them go to England, rally under the Union Jack, and sing, 'God Save the King.' Let Chicago again take its place as the champion of true Americanism.

At another meeting Mayor Thompson declared:

They will vote for Bill Thompson and no future draft, or they will vote for Dever and Brennan and the draft of the American boys whenever Europe demands it.

They will vote for Thompson and no cancellation of foreign loans, or they will vote for my opponents and give the power to cancel the loans to the League of Nations. They will vote for Americanization of our public schools and the expulsion of McAndrew, the pro-British superintendent imported from New York, or they will vote to keep him in.¹⁸

As to the reality of this issue, little need be said.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, March 18, 1927.

¹⁸ *Chicago Tribune*, April 4, 1927.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

Some of the school histories in question were adopted in Mayor Thompson's former term. Mr. Dever and Mr. Brennan whom he attacked as pro-British are both of Irish descent, and Mayor Dever humorously said that his good mother, if she were alive, would be much puzzled at the charge that he was subservient to the King of England. The objection to the histories was partly that they admitted that there were two sides to the Revolutionary War, but chiefly that they failed to mention the foreign soldiers who assisted the colonists.

But this sort of talk largely decided a great city election. Thompson won the election by a plurality of 83,000 over Dever.

7. SUMMARY—THE EXTENT OF POLITICAL CONFUSION

Surely our politics is discordant and incoherent. It is twisted at every turn by the prejudices of alien groups, and the fear of those prejudices. We are in turmoil, petty sometimes, turbulent often, with riots and quarrels of our alien groups even when they do not involve the general public. But time and again we have seen ourselves placed in great danger by the activities of alien groups. They long delayed our entrance into the war. They did their best to bring us to war with England for the sake of Ireland. We not only breed trouble for ourselves, but we stir up dissension in Europe. Our newspapers and politicians opposed to the League of Nations and the World Court vociferate that we want to keep out of

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the quarrels of Europe. Yet time and again, to obtain group votes in America, these same politicians actually egg on quarrels in Europe. They have encouraged revolt in Ireland, Egypt and India; they have stimulated the Greeks in Asia Minor, and both Italians and Jugoslavs in their controversy over Fiume. Alien groups press their special views on us in the consideration of the League of Nations, the World Court, war debts, immigration; and their prejudices and passions run athwart all our state, city and national politics. Our politicians have been so accustomed to consider the will of foreign groups, that it is with the utmost difficulty that a native opinion gets even a hearing. "I realize," a lawyer wrote to his United States Senator, "that my opinion and that of my friends is subject to a serious disqualification. We are all the children of native-born Americans."

Indeed, the discord created in our politics by foreign questions is so great that many persons declare that we are not sufficiently united to be a member of the League of Nations or a World Court or to take any part in world affairs. Their position, in short, is that we do not have one tradition and one viewpoint but twenty traditions and twenty viewpoints.

The Chicago *Tribune* has advanced this point of view many times through the seductive medium of McCutcheon's cartoons. For example, on April 25, 1923, it printed a cartoon depicting Uncle Sam gazing gravely at a sign headed "Foreign White Stock in the United States (Racially the Most Heteroge-

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

neous of All Nations)" and then below is given the number of British Americans, Irish Americans, Canadian Americans, German Americans, Austro Americans, Polish Americans, Italian Americans, Scandinavian Americans, Hebrew Yiddish Americans, Czecho Slovak Americans and Russian Americans.

Uncle Sam holds an invitation "to Join the League's World Court" and he is quoted as saying "Every one of my decisions in European affairs would make some of my citizens mad at me." The cartoon is headed "Judging European Controversies Would Be a Sure Way of Bringing Back the Hyphen in American Affairs." The *Tribune* has many times expressed this idea that we are too heterogeneous a nation to take part in such organizations as the League and the World Court.

But the idea is held by many responsible persons. Mr. Samuel Insull, in testifying before Senator Reed on Illinois primary expenditures, stated that he gave a great deal of money for Mr. Frank L. Smith's candidacy because he was very strongly opposed to the United States entering the World Court. "Particularly am I opposed to a country such as this, with its heterogeneous population, being tied up with the political affairs of Europe."¹⁹

Mr. John W. O'Leary, then president of the International Chamber of Commerce, speaking at the Brussels Convention, June 25, 1925, expressed the same idea that our population is too diverse to per-

¹⁹ Chicago *American*, August 4, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

mit of international action. "We are a great nation," he said, "made up from the descendants of all the great nations of Europe. There does exist among our people a sentiment towards the homelands of their ancestors which is deep and abiding. The very fact of the diversity of our inheritance makes it almost impossible for America to intervene on one side or the other in European political affairs. The American tradition is founded on common sense."

President Harding was strongly impressed with the same conclusion. In his book, *Our Common Country*, he said:

It was my official duty to sit with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when it was hearing the American spokesmen for foreign peoples during the peace conference at Paris. Under the rules we could give hearing only to Americans, though many whom we had no right to hear sought to bring their appeal to the Senate as though it possessed some sense of justice which had no voice at Paris. We heard the impassioned appeals of Americans of foreign birth on behalf of the lands from which they came—where their kinsfolk resided. No one doubted their sincerity; no one questioned their right to be interested. But for me there was a foreboding, a growing sense of apprehension.

How can we have American concord; how can we expect American unity; how can we escape strife, if we in America attempt to meddle in the affairs of Europe and Asia and Africa; if we assume to settle boundaries; if we attempt to end the rivalries and jealousies of centuries of Old World strife? It is not alone the menace which lies in involvement abroad; it is the greater danger which lies in conflict among adopted Americans.

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT

This is the objection to the foreign policy attempted, not with the advice and consent of the Senate, but in spite of warning informally uttered. America wants the good-will of foreign peoples, and it does not want the ill-will of foreign born who have come to dwell among us. . . .

That policy, my countrymen, is a bad policy. It is bad enough abroad, but it is even more menacing at home. Meddling abroad tends to make Americans forget that they are Americans. It tends to arouse the old and bitter feelings of race, or former nationality, or foreign ancestry, in the hearts of those who ought never to be forced to turn their hearts away from undivided loyalty and interest given to 'America first.'

I want America on guard against that course which naturally tends to array Americans against one another. I do not know whether or not Washington foresaw this menace when he warned us against entangling alliances and meddling abroad, but I see it, and I say to you that all America must stand firm against this dangerous and destructive and un-American policy. Meddling is not only dangerous to us, because it leads us into entanglements against which Washington warned us, but it also threatens an America divided in her own household, and tends to drive into groups seeking to make themselves felt in our political life, men and women whose hearts are led away from 'America First' to 'Hyphen First.'²⁰

I cannot agree with the opinions of those who believe that the United States has already become so heterogeneous that she will be torn asunder if she takes part in the affairs of the world. If they are right, we have already ceased to be a nation, for a country so divided in its thought that it cannot act as a nation with other nations, is no nation at all. While

²⁰ Warren G. Harding, *Our Common Country*, pp. 161-165.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

I have given in these pages a mass of evidence of discord of opinion founded on alien biases, and distorting racial prejudices, it is notable that in no case has the alien sentiment finally prevailed. It has delayed and thwarted our action for the time being, but in the end it has always lost. It did not keep us out of the war with Germany, it did not obtain recognition of the Irish Republic, it did not keep us out of the Four Power Treaty, it did not succeed in defeating the ratification of the World Court resolution. It greatly stimulated our opposition to the League of Nations and yet it is notorious that a slight compromise on the wording of the Lodge reservations in 1920 would have enabled the Covenant to pass the Senate. It did not prevent immigration restriction. Generally speaking, while it has made trouble and turmoil, it has never succeeded in its main objects.

But the fact that many persons seriously believe that we are too diverse to act in foreign affairs, the facts I have cited of that diversity, are ominous indeed. And no one can deny that the evidence of disunion is most disquieting.

CHAPTER XI

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

I. OPPOSING IDEALS—THE ATTACK ON THE UNIFIED NATION.

We have seen that since the World War threw us, as never before, into world politics, we have been pressed and harried by the demands of alien groups who have tried to divert us from our natural course. We have had many nationalisms instead of one.

But it may be said that this entire argument is based on a narrow nationalism. I can imagine many persons of international ideals reading this story with increasing irritation and finally exclaiming, "Well, what of it? America is simply becoming internationalized. She is acquiring, through pain and struggle, it is true, the ideals and opinions of an internationalized society. Her provincial Americanism is coming in contact with the ideals of many nations. She will take much from them, and in the end she will be the richer for the additions."

Thus, Jane Addams has for years deplored the narrowness of the old colonial stock in not adopting from the immigrant the customs and institutions that have worked efficiently with him, or at least in not allowing the immigrant to maintain his own institutions in this land. For example, she criticized us

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

severely because we would not allow the Doukhobors to continue their system of communal ownership of land in America. In Russia, they had been accustomed to the village ownership of land and they found that our institutions did not provide for it. So they had to conform to our system or leave, and they left. Her comment was, "We also exhibit all the Anglo-Saxon distrust of any experiment with land tenure."¹

She protested against our attempts to unify our immigrants on the basis of our colonial ideals. "It is useless," she said, "to hypnotize ourselves by unreal talk of colonial ideals and patriotic duty towards immigrants as if it were a question of passing a set of resolutions. A commingling of racial habits and national characteristics in the race in the end must rest upon the voluntary balance and concord of many forces."²

Again she declared that the policy of restriction "is not noble or generous and in my mind not one to commend itself to the American people. We need here all sound brain and brawn, in the oldest as well as the newest parts of our country. Trade, commerce, and manufactures are becoming international. We have even internationalized unions. These organizations themselves see that the problems are transcending national bounds."³

In short, she would make of America a sort of mosaic of many nations, and its social and political

¹ *Educational Review*, Vol. 19, p. 257.

² *Ibid.*, p. 263.

³ *Charities*, Vol. 15, p. 376.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY
institutions a mosaic of the standards and institutions
of many nations.

I have already noted in my attempt at a definition
of a nation Walter Lippmann's belief that the
American tradition can no longer unite us, and that
purpose, an ideal for the future, alone can do it.

The most organized attack on the traditional
American belief in a unified nation has been made by
Horace M. Kallen. In a series of articles in the
Nation in 1915, since enlarged into a book, he flatly
attacked the whole American tradition. He
admits all that I say of the persistence of alien
traits. He has no illusions as to the facile working
of the melting-pot. "Men," he says, "may change
their clothes, their politics, their wives, their reli-
gions, their philosophies to a greater or less extent;
they cannot change their grandfathers. Jews or
Poles or Anglo-Saxons, in order to cease being Jews
or Poles or Anglo-Saxons would have to cease
to be."

He agrees that the old popular belief in a magic
cauldron is puerile folly. His conclusion is the direct
opposite of mine. Because a unified nation is im-
possible if immigration continues, he would give up
the unified nation. I would stop the immigration.

He has no illusions as to rapid conversion to
Americanism. "The Riises and Steiners and An-
tins," he says acutely, "together with Edward Bok,
and their numerous other recent imitators mostly
female and Jewish, protest too much; they are too
self-conscious and self-centered, their 'Americaniza-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

tion' appears too much like an achievement, a tour de force, too little like a growth."⁴

He continues, "For decidedly the older America, whose voice and whose spirit was New England has by virtue of business, of commercialism, of the immigrant, gone beyond recall. . . . The older tradition has passed from a life into a memory, and the newer one, so far as it has an Anglo-Saxon base, is holding its own beside more and more formidable competitors, the expression in appropriate form of the national inheritances of the various states of the Union, populations of whom their national self-consciousness is perhaps their chief spiritual asset, as their labor power is their chief economic asset."⁵

So he concludes that it is impossible to unite our powerful groups under the old American tradition. He believes that we must give up the ideal of a united America and take in its place that of a federal state, in which each racial group will be a constituent part. "For in effect," he says, "the United States are in the process of becoming a federal state not merely as a union of geographical and administrative unities, but also as a federation or commonwealth of national cultures."⁶

So he thinks we are "at the parting of the ways." "What do Americans *will* to make of the United States—a unison singing the old British theme 'America' the America of the New England school? or a harmony in which that theme shall be dominant

⁴ Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, p. 86, Boni & Liveright.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

perhaps, among others, but one among many, not the only one?"⁷

His solution is to let the racial groups remain, each with its own customs and traditions—perhaps even language—to make a federal state of all and not make all into a nation. "Taking for its point of departure, the existing ethnic and cultural group, it would seek to provide conditions under which each might attain the cultural perfection that is proper to its kind. . . . Its form would be that of the federal republic, its substance a democracy of nationalities, co-operating voluntarily and autonomously through common institutions in the enterprise of self-realization through the perfection of men according to their kind." It would be "a multiplicity in a unity, an orchestration of mankind."⁸

Even President Eliot frequently declared that racial groups should remain separate. Though he undoubtedly believed in the maintenance of our legal and political traditions, he opposed not only marriage between those of different racial groups but the loss of their peculiar traditions and customs. His objection to intermarriage was partly due to his belief, already cited, that crossing of races entails unfortunate physical consequences. But he told the Jews not to abandon the traditions of their race. "What we want in this country," he said to the Harvard Zionist Society, "is a number of races, with various gifts, each contributing its own peculiar qualities to the common welfare."⁹

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 116. ⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 121. ⁹ *New York Times*, December 13, 1924.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

In substantiating his theories, President Eliot spoke of the emigration of the Irish to America, declaring that the Irish 'have never been assimilated in America, anywhere, and that it is not desirable that they should be. So it should be with the Jews.'

'Americans,' President Eliot continued, 'do not expect to assimilate any foreign people, even the Jews. It seems that non-assimilation is better for the future of the nation.'¹⁰

Of course, Zangwill's ideal of the melting-pot was definitely and jubilantly opposed to any idea of dominance of the old America. America was not to assimilate the immigrant, but old-stock Americans and immigrants together were to amalgamate to create the future commonwealth. Their ideals, customs and institutions were to fuse along with the physical men and women. The only dominant institutions were those which would emerge as the products of the melting-pot. In his "Afterword" to his play *The Melting Pot*, he said:

The process of American amalgamation is not assimilation, or simple surrender to the dominant type as is popularly supposed but an all-round give-and-take by which the final type may be enriched or improved. Thus the intelligent reader will have remarked how the somewhat anti-Semitic Irish servant of the first act talks Yiddish herself in the fourth. Even as to the ultimate language of the United States, it is unreasonable to suppose that American, though fortunately protected by English literature, will not bear traces of the fifty languages now being spoken side by side with it, and of which this play alone presents scraps in German, French, Russian, Yiddish, Irish, Hebrew and Italian.¹¹

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Zangwill, *The Melting Pot*, p. 203.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Such are a few representative statements of the opinion opposed to the old melting-pot ideal, or at least the possibility of attainment of that ideal, the ideal of an America united under its old tradition.

Of course, the above opinions are not consistent with each other and some of them are not consistent with themselves. Mr. Zangwill, at times, certainly states a belief in a unified America, a new America, but one. That is the ideal of David in his play. Mr. Lippmann believes in uniting us on a purpose, until a new tradition develops.

But Mr. Kallen frankly says that not only is the old unity impossible, but that a future unity is impossible. The melting-pot cannot fuse us into one. We can only be a federation of diverse unities.

Mr. Zangwill, poet that he was, is inconsistent with himself. He says that we are not a nation, but are and must continue to be a continent. Yet his play, *The Melting Pot*, was vibrant with the ideal of a melting-pot which would make us one. David, his Jewish hero, says that the melting-pot would make us physically one, perhaps it would achieve the "coming superman." Yet in his "Afterword" to the play Zangwill said: "Whether any nation will ever again be based like those of the Old World upon a unity of race or religion is a matter of doubt." He said that the ideals of a nation were not for us; we were a continent. Yet in the play, David declared that out of the crucible would come a new nation. "How the great Alchemist melts and fuses them with

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

his purging flame," he said.¹² A continent is not made one. Moreover, Zangwill criticized us because we did not have the virtues of a nation. In his farewell address to America on the occasion of his visit in 1924, he complained: "I blame you for your isolationist stand in regard to reparations. Why don't you interfere and get it settled? . . . There is much inefficiency in America."¹³ He also declared at this time: "America is not a nation. It is a vast and chaotic social organism not yet thoroughly amalgamated." But a continent does not have a foreign policy. A continent is vast and chaotic. He criticized us for not being a nation and yet he said that we could not and should not be a nation.

These inconsistencies give us a hint that our objectors have not visualized the state they prefer to the one which they criticize so confidently.

In referring to Mr. Lippmann's belief that the past could not unite us, in treating the subject of the nature of a nation, I pointed out that the purpose which he said could alone unite us must be itself based on the past, that an ideal to be permanent is founded on the past. Surely if we are so disunited that the past cannot unite us, no ideal can do it. As our pasts differ, so will our ideals. I may admit that when we reach the condition which Mr. Lippmann thinks we are already in, we shall find that the past cannot unite us. Indeed, it is the whole purpose of this book to prove that that is true. But when we reach that extreme and parlous state, we shall cease

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹³ *New York Times*, February 6, 1924.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

to be a nation. We shall be a geographical expression, and shall remain such until a new past is able to unite us.

But we shall not cease to cherish our traditions simply because we find that they clash with others. The statement of Mr. Lippmann that our ancestral habits and customs, the legends and history of our past cannot unite us, will not of itself cause the old stock to give them up. Miss Addams is full of criticism of the old stock because it will not adjust itself to the immigrants. But how about the immigrants who will not adjust themselves to the old stock? We hear far less criticism of that among the friends of the newer arrivals. Traditions are stubborn things, and if it is difficult for the immigrant to give them up, it is also difficult for the old stock to do so, and the old stock after all is half our white population, and it has all the force of this country's past welling through it. At best the past of each of the immigrant races comes from a foreign land and even if the numbers were equal, the tradition of the native would have the greater power. The native tradition will not be given up, and if immigration had been allowed to continue in full sweep, the traditions of the immigrant would persist also, and the only result would be a grievous and continual clash.

At the opposite extreme is Mr. Kallen, who would avoid the clash by separating the races. He would give up the ideal of unity now and make a congeries of states. His argument is mainly interesting as testimony of one of the newer races, that the newer

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

immigrant rejects the ideal of unity in America. For manifestly, it is impossible to realize his federal state. There is no possibility of moving all the Italians into one state, all the Greeks into another, all the Jews into another, all the Russians into another. Either we make a state out of many racial groups, living together in one state, or we don't make it at all.

The most salient feature of the dissenting opinions of Miss Addams, Mr. Kallen and Mr. Zangwill is their rejection of the old ideal of a coherent nation. The old American stock still thinks of America as a nation, unified, coherent, with a law, a politics, and a tradition of its own. Many of the immigrants think of it as a continent. We have seen how Miss Addams referred to the internationalization of ideas and customs as preferable to the old colonial ideal. Professor Kallen wants a federal state of diverse units. Zangwill, as I have said, is inconsistent, but in his "Afterword" he distinctly rejected the ideal of a coherent nation. "The notion that the few millions of people in America have a moral right to exclude others is monstrous. Exclusiveness may have some justification in countries, especially when old and well-populated; but for continents like the United States—or for the matter of that for Canada and Australia,—to mistake themselves for countries is an intolerable injustice to the rest of the human race."¹⁴ In his farewell address in 1924 he said: "There is no excuse for a restricted immigration policy. That will bring you merely into a narrow

¹⁴Zangwill, *The Melting Pot*, p. 203.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

nationalism. There is no excuse, I say. You could tuck every European country, with the exception of Russia, into the United States. Do remember that you are not a country, but a continent. The ideas that are applicable to countries cannot be applied to continents."¹⁵

Even Professor John Dewey expressed the same belief of the internationalism of America. "The peculiarity of our nationalism is its internationalism," he said.¹⁶

Except in that of President Eliot, there runs all through this criticism the international note. A simple, unified nation does not awaken the loyalties of these dissenters. As they evidently believe in a world internationalism, they would like to see us lead the way and they believe we are leading the way by establishing internationalism on this continent. We have seen that even so old an American as President Coolidge believes that America is an example of internationalism.

I do not propose to argue long the merits of internationalism. The world certainly needs more co-operation and harmony between nations. But that is far from saying that nations should be abolished. I am convinced that nationalism is often confused with the evils of nationalism, or rather that patriotism is too often confused with nationalism, if we choose to use the word "nationalism" to mean the aspects of modern nations that we dislike. Chauvinism and

¹⁵ *New York Times*, February 6, 1924.

¹⁶ Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, p. 131.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

patriotism are antithetical, not synonymous. Because national loyalty is used for base ends is no more an argument against it than because family loyalty may be used for base ends is an argument against the family. To my mind, as the family is the base of society, so no less patriotism, the warm loyalty to a small community, is the base of all international action. To a large extent, the root of nationalistic evils is that selfish purposes use nations for their ends. There is no reason to believe that if nations became units of a world state, selfish interests would not use the parts of the world state to play on their jealousies and prejudices for their ends.

One cannot but be struck by the psychology of many of our post-war internationalists, who declare that they do not believe in national loyalties, and are moved only by an international ideal. One is forced to feel that many of them conceal their lack of loyalty for their own country by expanding their ideal of loyalty. I remember vividly how in 1915 and 1916, it was the deluded young men who were animated by deep national feeling who enlisted in the French ambulance and aviation service. Their loyalty to their own country made them realize the tragedy to a Frenchman or a Belgian of the destruction of their countries. In a sense they were the true internationalists because they saw a cause beyond that of their own country. The first to see the force of the cause of the Allies were ardent lovers of the ideal of this country. The so-called internationalists were apt to be pacifists, to say that it made little difference under

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

which government a Belgian lived. Internationalists of my acquaintance bitterly criticized their young friends who enlisted in the French service. They could not see the cause. Their loyalty to their own country was so slight that they could not be moved by a display of loyalty to another country.

It is to be seriously doubted whether for many generations men will be able to develop a loyalty for something so big and ponderous as a world state. Our minds need something smaller, more intimate, to love and cherish. But an actual world state is so far in the future as not to be worthy of discussion. Cooperation between nations depends on the nations being coherent units. It will never be built up by spreading loyalty so wide that it has no force. A combination of jarring internationalisms in the same nation is not the basis for any international thought or action. It will first have to be fused into a whole, then it will become nationalism, and then, and only then, can it become a part of international activity. A league or association of nations implies that each nation must have a sufficient unity to be a coherent whole, to have a distinct and fruitful policy. Even a city, or an American state, if it would realize its dreams, must be more than a mere jarring collection of atoms. If a nation is continually torn by the racial quarrels of its constituent groups, it will either have no policy at all, or its policy will be limited to creating trouble in the interests of the nations from which its racial groups came. America is in this danger

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

already and some worthy persons, as we have seen, think we have already reached it.

The orchestration of separate diverse groups is apparently difficult, if not impossible. Discord and not harmony results. Our dilemma is that if we mix races we may get lamentable physical results and that the constituent immigrant races will lose their own standards without acquiring those of America, while if we keep racial groups apart we get friction, discord and negation.

2. POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON OUR POLITICAL CAPACITY

But the internal effects of racial heterogeneity cut deeper still. For one thing, no one can tell what will be the effect of multitudinous and diverse immigration on our political capacity itself.

I have made only one assertion of superiority in the native stock. I have said that it has shown a marked capacity for self-government. The immigrant and his friends love to sneer at its failures, at oil scandals and Ohio political gangs. They still cite Adams County, Ohio, as a sample of the political morality of native American stock. The jibes are unhistorical and ill-based. Judging in the large, the American commonwealth has been a magnificent success. We have our failures and weaknesses, but where are the successes of the countries from which our Continental immigration comes? No other nation, save only Great Britain and the British Dominions, has made a political success in any way comparable to ours. That may seem like boasting

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

but I think it is the sober truth—a truth testified to by such students as Bryce, the Englishman, and Esmein, the Frenchman. And why may not the old stock be allowed its one boast in these days when the critics snap at its heels? Italy has no achievement in democracy, Greece has none, Russia has none, Germany has none, the Balkan states have none. In the past few years there have been dictators in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Turkey, Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Belgium. The Anglo-Saxon peoples as yet are the leaders in the development of free institutions.

We are told that capacity for self-government is not an inborn trait, that it can be acquired, and that the peoples of other nations have not had a chance to show their powers. Ah! but did not the Anglo-Saxon peoples make their chance? One sometimes wonders if the sober restraint, the initiative, the independent self-reliance, the ability at team-play, which are essential to self-government, are in any way native to the populations of southern and eastern Europe and whether, if they come to dominance, our politics may not entirely change its tone and become the fevered or fitful record of alternate despotism and revolution.

Let us assume that the other peoples of Europe have the capacity for political action. But they have not shown it yet, and, after all, whether political ability is native or acquired, habit and tradition are essential for its successful exercise. It will certainly take long practice to make of peoples unaccustomed

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

to political action, the sober, restrained, self-reliant peoples that those have become who are used to political action. The native stock has had six generations of experience in this country in political affairs. The English and Scotch who come to us have been disciplined by political experience and institutions akin to ours. Those from other nations must learn their political experience here.

But many of our newer immigrants seem to lack not only political experience but political desire. It is a striking and disquieting fact that, without exception, the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe do not become citizens in anything like the degree that those who do come from northern and western Europe. They remain to a large degree silent, non-participating members in our midst. They do not contribute to our political action. They are not learning political habits.

The 1920 Census figures showed the following percentages of foreign-born males over twenty-one years of age who had become citizens:

Country	Percentage
England.....	64.8
Scotland.....	63.6
Wales.....	73.5
Ireland.....	72.3
Norway.....	67.3
Sweden.....	69.5
Denmark.....	69.6
Netherlands.....	58.1
Belgium and Luxemburg.....	55.3

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Switzerland.....	64.9
France.....	60.1
Germany.....	73.3
Canada French.....	47.0
Canada Other.....	58.0
Poland.....	27.9
Czecho-Slovakia.....	44.7
Austria.....	36.4
Hungary.....	28.1
Jugoslavia.....	21.4
Russia.....	41.7
Lithuania.....	25.5
Finland.....	39.2
Roumania.....	40.8
Bulgaria and Turkey in Europe.....	12.8
Greece.....	17.1
Italy.....	30.2
Spain.....	8.9
Portugal.....	17.3 ¹⁷

Are we certain that the children of those who do not even care to be naturalized are material for the maintenance of free institutions?

3. RACIAL DIVERSITY ENDANGERS OUR SOCIAL HARMONY AND OUR INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT

So far, the evidence I have given has all been of political disunion and its effects, largely on our external politics. But we shall find that our racial diversity is threatening not only our political unity, but our social and intellectual harmony as well.

¹⁷ 1920 Census, Vol. II, Population, p. 806.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Like-mindedness is the source of all the finer cultural development of a community; its education, its law, its literature depend thereon. Yet we can see the disintegrating effect of extreme racial diversity in our schools, in our respect for law, and in our literature itself.

(a) *The Schools*

To those of us who are still young, the public schools were a religion. We have considered them the first great instrument of our democracy. They were indeed the great melting-pot, not of races, but of classes. Of course, we did not dream that the public schools could or did make over the social order, but they did make for a real unified understanding. In the Middle West thirty or forty years ago there were, generally speaking, no private schools for boys. While there were private schools for girls, they were not numerous. Most girls from families of means and practically all the boys went to the public schools. The experience of contact with children of other economic groups gave them a knowledge of life, an understanding of the worth of people of other experiences which they will never lose.

To-day, in our great cities, this is largely changed. The sons and daughters not of the rich only, but also those of moderate means, go to private schools. Partly is this due in many sections of the country to increased wealth, and contact with people of in-

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

creased wealth in other sections on the part of the parents. But very largely, in the big cities like New York, Boston and Chicago, it is due to the fact that the parents do not want their children in the same schools with the children of the immigrants. It does not help to call this snobbishness. We have seen that workingmen have the same prejudices. Moreover, once again I beg to say that we are not conducting a school of conduct, but attempting to gauge the working of social and political forces. Blaming the parents will not change their decisions. Moreover, much of the tendency is absolutely justified. In an article in the *American Mercury* for August, 1926, Mr. Chester T. Crowell told some of the reasons why. He told how his children came home in the first days of school in Brooklyn "wide eyed with excitement, to tell us disturbing tales of severe corporal punishment inflicted upon various members of their classes. They had never seen anything like that before. But when they recounted the offenses that caused these punishments it seemed to us that the teachers were models of mercy. Personally, I would have prescribed chloroform." Then his wife visited the school and found that the school consisted almost entirely of the children of the immigrants, who simply had not had the social and physical education that native-born Americans have in their homes. Much of the time of the school routine was taken up with lessons in cleanliness and in various forms of "Americanization" which were not needed by the native-born children. His children received grades

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

for brushing their teeth. He found that the standards of the school were graded to meet the average of the pupils, which naturally was lower than it would be among pupils who were not required to spend so much time on matters that Americans are taught at home. In short, in our public schools in the large cities, we are teaching people of several stages of development at the same time. The school suffers, as does the city, from diverse standards and traditions. Consequently, as many parents as can afford it take their children out of the public schools.

Moreover, with the growth of the Catholic population, another large element of our child population has been withdrawn from the public schools. The influence of the public schools on our democracy is, therefore, steadily diminishing. The power of their democratic example has been materially weakened.

Our diverse racial elements have also made their influence felt in the teaching of the public schools. During the last ten years a highly desirable, though long delayed tendency to make our school histories tell the history of the Revolution without entire deference to national prejudices, began to manifest itself. There is not one of us over the age of thirty who has not had his judgment of England warped by the partial school histories he read as a boy. There was in them no attempt to show that the Revolution was but part of the struggle for English liberty, that the people of England were threatened by King George as much as we were. There was no attempt to show that there were serious failings of the colonies in their

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

attitude to Great Britain. There was no attempt to admit that the old well-established legal opinion was that the colonies were municipal corporations, that the whole subject of colonial government was in its infancy, or that England even then was the most advanced nation in its dealings with its colonies, and that we enjoyed great political rights.

As a result of the school histories and the organized propaganda of the Irish in America, there has been perhaps a greater bitterness towards England for the war of 1775 than towards Germany for her more brutal offenses in 1917.

Recently the school histories have begun to tell the truth. Soon there began bitter attacks against their authors. Some of them, of course, came from those of old native stock who, like the fundamentalists, react excitedly to any outrage of their childhood precepts. Some of it comes from the nervous fear of any attacks on 100% Americanism of which we have seen so much, and which to my mind is largely due to the fact that the attacks have so often come from alien sources. I do not here, any more than elsewhere, excuse the prejudices of the native stock. But every nation has such prejudices, and they are curable only by the slow process of time. But the alien prejudice is something whose increase at least we can prevent. And much of the attack comes from those with an ancestral or a recent racial grudge against England.

In 1923 David Hirshfield, Commissioner of Accounts of New York City, made public a 40,000 word

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

report recommending that eight school histories be barred from the public schools of New York. He charged that the histories were part of the pro-British propaganda which sprang up in this country before the United States entered the war. He said that the "British and pro-British American propagandists are combining in a drive to influence public opinion here with the ultimate object of regaining the lost colonies" for England and making America part of the British Empire.¹⁸ He went on to say, according to the news account, that there was "an international money power behind all the historians, all the lecturers, all the writers who are trying to bring about closer relations between the United States and Great Britain. The real purpose of such writers and speakers, as Hirshfield sees it, is to dominate the world through an Anglo-American union based on British rather than American superiority."

But the animus of the criticism is found when we see that, according to the *New York Times'* account, "the spirit of Andrew Carnegie's dream for a 're-united state,' the British-American Union according to Hirshfield is carried out by the Carnegie Libraries, Foundation for Advancement of Learning, Division of Intercorrelated Education, Aid for Vocational Education, Association for International Conciliation and the Carnegie Pension Fund for American professors, and even American judges." Mr. Hirshfield declared that these institutions have resulted in

¹⁸ *New York Times*, June 5, 1923.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY
influencing teachers' associations in favor of revising
the history text-books with a pro-British slant.

According to Hirshfield, the 'revisionists' among the school historians have been merely repeating propaganda used by Sir Gilbert Parker and Lord Northcliffe in 'putting it over' on the American people during the war. He says that George Haven Putnam, the New York publisher has been active in the movement to revise the text-books in favor of England.

Hirshfield charges several organizations with carrying on propaganda in this country for making the United States part of the British Empire. The organizations he sees in this work, he says, are the Sons of St. George, the English-Speaking Union, the Sulgrave Institute, the Pilgrim Society, the Church Peace Union, the World Alliance for promoting International Friendship, through the Churches, the American Association for International Co-operation, the Magna Charta Association, and the National Security League.¹⁹

It is a fair inference from the above quotations that this report was animated by a hatred of England that did not arise from native sources.

The Knights of Columbus declare that our histories are so prejudiced that they have decided to prepare their own history of the United States. They object, likewise, to the project of observing Magna Charta day in this country. The Ancient Order of Hibernians in Chicago protested against the inclusion of "America" in the school song-books, the cogent reason being that it has the same tune as "God Save the King."

A school teacher wrote to the *New York Times*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that parents even objected to the teaching of Shakespeare because he was an Englishman. Another wrote that the school teachers had been circularized by the Friends of Irish Freedom, and that they were ordered to present a drive for Irish relief to the pupils and that "teachers who had spoken in a friendly way of England have received threatening letters from Irish agitators."

Perhaps the most vicious campaign against school histories was that made by Mayor Thompson in Chicago, referred to in Chapter X. In that chapter, I treated the subject as part of a political campaign. Here I wish to treat it as a manifestation of alien psychology, as a part of the special subject of school histories. We have seen that the chief complaint in Chicago was that mention of von Steuben, Pulaski and Kosciuszko was omitted from one textbook. There is a large Polish and German population in Chicago. Thompson attacked a statement in one history that

the average American still accepts, without qualification, or question, the partisan justifications of the struggle for independence which have come down from the actual participants in the affair on the American side.

These accounts, colored by the emotions and understandings of the times, and designed to arouse the colonists to a warlike pitch against the British government, have formed the basis of the treatment in our school text books and have served to perpetuate judgments of the American Revolution which no fair-minded historian can accept to-day.²⁰

²⁰ Chicago *Tribune*, April 18, 1927.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Another statement objected to was that the English cotton operatives prayed for Union success in the Civil War.

These statements, so heatedly objected to, are, of course, simply the sober truth.

Partly what Mayor Thompson and others who agreed with him objected to was the shock to their childhood-formed complexes. This same shock explains much of the bitterness of the fundamentalist. But the political group psychology is very important. The alien groups who hate the British cannot bear to see fairness shown to them. But the Chicago situation develops a different and very interesting phase and that is the insistence of newer foreign groups that they be mentioned and praised in our histories. There is a naïve and in some ways even pathetic and understandable desire to identify themselves with our past. The Poles, who were not here when the country started, want recognition to their race through the mention of Pulaski and Kosciusko. Again and again bitter complaint was made that one history omitted in its last edition the following sentence contained in an earlier edition:

There were five eminent foreign gentlemen who fought in the American army. Two of these, La Fayette and John Kalb were Frenchmen; two others, Kosciusko and Pulaski were Poles, and the fifth, Baron Steuben, was a German.

A volunteer committee of citizens appeared before the Board of Education's school administration committee and made their demands of what should be

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

included in the new syllabus history, which, supplemented by collateral reading, should constitute the course in American history. The syllabus, the newspaper account stated, must, according to the volunteer committee,

take cognizance of the fact that the Germans rendered no inconsiderable aid to the cause of the American Revolution.

It must be ever mindful of the fact that thousands of Irish (not Scotch-Irish several of yesterday's speakers protested) have played a valiant part in the Revolution.

It must give La Fayette a tribute of more than the one hundred or two hundred or three hundred words now accorded to him in many text-books of American history.

It must give adequate credit to Kosciusko and to Pulaski; to De Grasse and to De Kalb.

And this new history must not be pro-British either statistically or psychologically.²¹

The chairman of the volunteer committee raised the usual specter of "a conspiracy by England to add to its world possessions, and even by propaganda 'to win America back as a possession' through a preliminary British-American union."²²

In other words, the new history must be fair to every nation but Great Britain, and it would seem that it must give the impression that the Revolution was won by a few foreigners. One had thought that Washington's army was composed overwhelmingly of Americans, or at least of nationally conscious colonials. It is strange, too, to see the advocates of "America first," who despise all foreigners, so insistent on

²¹ *Ibid.*, May 4, 1927.

²² *Chicago Herald-Examiner*, May 4, 1927.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

the mention of men who were not even residents of America.

Evidently to write a fair history of the Revolution one officer or soldier from Poland is worth ten thousand native colonials. If all must be mentioned, it would seem fairer to give the entire roll of the Continental Army after the story of each battle. That at least would give us some sense of proportion. And it has been decided that the new syllabus will solve the difficulty. It will cure the evil by doing justice to "every racial strain which has contributed to our national history." Well, this can be done by some sacrifice to proportion by mentioning Pulaski and Kosciusko for the Poles, but what are we going to do for the Yugoslavs, the Italians, the Greeks, the Russians, the Hungarians? Perhaps we shall have to invent a hero for each, for now we are writing history for votes. A local bit of verse puts it:

Every people and race
In Chicago will trace
Its hand in the ousting of Britain
We shall learn 'twas our town
That pulled George the III down
When the real revolution is written.

It is rather amusing to find from Washington's letters that he was hard put to it at times to know what to do with the foreign officers. He complained that they all wanted a major's commission or better, and that it would be bad policy to give them commands in the line because they could not talk English

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

and the men would not only not understand them but would resent their foreign mannerisms, and moreover the American officers would resent having the foreigners placed over them. In a letter to Gouverneur Morris he finally concludes that "I do most devoutly wish that we had not a single foreigner among us, except the Marquis de Lafayette, who acts upon very different principles from those which govern the rest."²³

In the fall of 1927 the whole school-book madness broke forth again. The Board of Education brought proceedings to oust Superintendent McAndrews from office and one of the charges was that he had sanctioned the use of pro-British and British propaganda school-books. There is some question whether these charges were legally brought but a vast amount of evidence in regard to the school-books was introduced. The charges were the usual ones that there was an insidious campaign to depreciate our national heroes, to minimize the part played by foreigners in the Revolution, to favor the British and with the specter always in the background that the ultimate design was to subject us to the sovereignty of Great Britain. The witnesses before the School Board brought up the usual charges of those afflicted with the furors Anglicus that the Carnegie Foundation is working to subject our country to Great Britain. They quoted Cecil Rhodes' will and they cited every quotation in the school-books which showed any at-

²³ W. C. Ford, *The Writings of George Washington*, Vol. 7, pp. 116-8, Putnam's, 1890.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

tempt to state our Revolutionary history fairly, which they seized on as vicious propaganda. One witness instanced as a part of the insidious British plot the pamphlet by Frederick W. Peabody, urging the United States to cancel part of the war debts. Incidentally, Mr. Peabody's pamphlet is directed as much at the French and Belgian debts as the British. One witness cited many quotations from Muzzey's school history, stating that he charges that Washington was a rebel and a traitor, that the Continental Congress was a "collection of quarrelsome pettifogging lawyers and mechanics," that Boston was described as a "center of vulgar sedition," and that the Boston Tea Party was the "last straw." This witness did state at one place in his testimony that the statements he objected to were sometimes given as quotations, but in the body of his testimony he made no qualifications—for example, stating that the history teaches "the British and Tory versions that the 'Boston Tea Party was the last straw.' The colonists had added insult to injury." In every case the statements objected to were quotations representing the view of King George and his cabinet. The essence of the matter is that the objectors to the histories believe that both sides of the Revolutionary controversy shall not be taught. I asked one man who sympathized with the attack on the school-books if he wanted the school-books to teach that our Mexican War was unjust and he said he did; if he wanted the southern side of the Civil War controversy fairly presented, and he said he did; if he

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

wanted the German side of the World War presented, and he said he did; and then if he wanted the British side of the Revolutionary War presented and he said that that was a different question because there was an insidious campaign to bring us back to the British Empire. This wild vagary of annexation to Great Britain is, I am convinced, at the bottom of this complex. One witness before the School Board declared, "The work is merrily going on to annex the United States."

Representatives of German societies in Chicago presented to Mayor Thompson a communication supporting him in his campaign on the school-books and condemning those who take his defiance to the British Crown "facetiously."²⁴ Yet a dispatch from Milwaukee²⁵ stated that the former president of the Steuben Society's unit in that city stated that he would lead a fight against pro-British and anti-German text-books in the Milwaukee public schools, objecting to a passage stating that Belgium "was attacked in cold blood in spite of treaties written for the special purpose of defending her and signed by Germany," and another stating that the lives of one hundred and fourteen Americans on the *Lusitania* were "thus taken by Germany" and that "a wave of horror swept around the world and most Americans who had not been convinced upon the merits of the war by the destruction of Belgium now saw Germany in a new and ghastly light."

To cap this mad school-book business, a Dutch

²⁴ *Chicago Tribune*, October 23, 1927.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, October 26, 1927.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

society demanded that the school histories give "greater recognition to the part played by the Dutch in making America," and a committee of Indians in war paint asked that prominent men of Indian blood "should be represented to the school children."²⁶ The Italians demanded that the "viking blot" be removed "from the escutcheon of Christopher Columbus." That is, they did not want the school histories to give Leif Ericson the credit of discovering America. The newspaper account stated that the spokesmen of Chicagoans of Italian descent said they "were exercised by a report that leading Norwegian societies in Chicago were planning soon to present a formal petition to Mayor Thompson asking that Ericson supplant Columbus as the original discoverer of America in history school books."²⁷ And in reply it was stated that, "Determined to inject into the school histories a full account of the 350 'forgotten years' of American history and to resist any attempt to name the Leif Ericson drive in honor of Christopher Columbus, leading Chicagoans of Norwegian descent yesterday began to marshal an array of historical data to support their contention that Leif Ericson and not Christopher Columbus was the original European discoverer of America."²⁸

The climax of this extraordinary campaign was an attack on pro-British and anti-German books in the public library. One ardent investigator declared that all pro-British books should be removed from

²⁶ *New York Times*, November 7, 1927.

²⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, November 16, 1927.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, November 20, 1927.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

the library, and that he would hold a public bonfire of them. Mayor Thompson denied that he wished to remove or burn pro-British books, but stated he objected to a reading booklet issued by the public library which recommended a reading course which he considered pro-British. He said the quotations he objected to in these books were, for example, "Now that we have invited our nation to enter the World Court, what should be our attitude towards the League of Nations?" Another was, "What is the reasonable attitude for us to adopt in regard to the repayment of sums loaned to European nations during and since the World War?" Another was "The war was fought by the powers allied against Germany for the avowed purpose of preventing an effort on the part of Germany to arrest or denature the progress of the human race."²⁹

Through all the attack on the histories can be seen the bitterness of men who were opposed to the World War, and are now expressing much accumulated feeling. One of the witnesses in Chicago was a former editor of a pro-German magazine which was suppressed in the war.

It is difficult to express one's sense of futility at this bargaining in the writing of history which, if carried out, will make a racial crazy-quilt of history and which has already stirred up bitter jealousies. It is evil enough to deal with the complexes aroused by our school histories of the past. But, added to these,

²⁹ *Chicago Daily News*, October 27, 1927.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

we have not only the naïve desire for recognition, but the hatreds and envies of a dozen new racial groups. We can sympathize with their desire to identify themselves with our past, but that desire, nay, demand, as it is now truculently expressed, is made without any sense of proportion, by an insistence that one foreigner must be accorded equal space with thousands of Americans. The racial groups who demand recognition in the histories are demanding recognition as racial groups, that their representatives be named as Germans, Poles, Irishmen, and not as Americans. They insist on identifying themselves with our past through their native countries by stressing their European origins. They insist that history be distorted to satisfy their racial demands and, above all, that fairness to Great Britain be denied and fairness to every other nation be accorded. The anti-English complex is the main root. So irrational is it that the very name "English" apparently causes a tremor of dislike. We are told that English is not spoken in Chicago. It is the American language which is spoken there. Indeed, the Illinois Legislature in 1919 solemnly resolved that the language of Illinois is the "American language."

From every side we see that large parts of our population do not want it taught that we got our law, our political system and much of our political liberty from England and the colonial stock. Yet we did. If a nation has its roots in the past, then that past must be taught. Traditions are of no force unless they are passed on. But large groups of our people do not

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

want the schools to help pass them on. They want our past written to fit their past and their prejudices. Is this the beginning of a demand that our past be repealed, and that a new past, beginning when the newer immigrant stocks began to come take its place?

(b) *Diverse Religions and Their Results*

Despite its delicate and controversial nature, reference must be made to the alien influence of Catholicism. It cannot be too often and too forcibly stated that no one objects to the religious beliefs of the American Catholic. There is a mass of passion and prejudice surrounding the subject, but a few things stand out, irrespective of all questions of belief. They are so ominous that they have done much to influence our immigration policy. Perhaps the majority of Americans believe, as a result of them, that while individual Catholics are desirable citizens and delightful friends, the proportion of Catholics in our population should not be increased. If it is increased, this alien psychology may seriously modify and damage our institutions.

In the first place, Catholicism has a foreign control and a foreign loyalty. As E. S. Martin remarked recently in *Life*, if Methodism or American Baptistry had a foreign control, they would be objects of serious concern to Americans.

*In the second place, the Catholic Church has several precepts which are absolutely inconsistent with

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

American principles of government. To allow those who believe in Catholic principles to become the majority in this country simply means that there would be a clash and discord between two diverse governmental ideals beside which any present or past discord would be mild indeed. The Catholic Church does not believe in the public schools. It does not believe in the separation of church and state. It does not believe in the supremacy of the state over the church in matters which our tradition calls political and on which the genius of our institutions required the supremacy of the State.

It may be said that Governor Smith's admirable letter in the Atlantic for April, 1927, should forever silence such comments. Indeed, I have no doubt they will be called bigoted. Evidently Governor Smith felt that Mr. Marshall's questions themselves betrayed intolerance and bigotry. The only objection I make to the tone and matter of Governor Smith's reply is his resentment at the questions put to him. He uttered "a fervent prayer that never again in this land will a public servant be challenged because of the faith in which he has tried to walk humbly with his God."

That seems to be the attitude of many newspapers and public men who spoke of his answer as a crushing rebuke to bigots. But surely if Governor Smith had answered that he accepted the teachings of the two popes quoted by Mr. Marshall, no one would have been bigoted who said that his opinions were

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

incompatible with leadership of the American democracy.

Governor Smith spiritedly rejected the positions taken by the two popes. He said they had no authority on such questions. He, therefore, instinctively realized that the questions at issue were not religious but political, and yet he resented the inquiry. Is it unfair to say that his resentment indicates that his own mind is not yet clear? For if the questions were political, there was no reason for resentment that his faith had been challenged. If they were really religious, he would not have answered them. Here is the crux of the whole question. For, as Mr. Marshall so admirably showed, the religious faith of Governor Smith was not challenged by Mr. Marshall. I have never heard it challenged by any "bigot" or any one else. There may be objection to Catholics on the ground of their religious belief, but if so it is negligible. Except for a mere handful, no one in American politics questions any man's Christian dogma or belief. There was some criticism of Taft's religious belief as a Unitarian in 1908, but it was laughed out of court. But whether a man believes in the separation of church and state, whether he believes in the public schools, whether he believes in the supremacy of the state in all questions which our political tradition calls political, are political questions and not religious. Mr. Marshall questioned Governor Smith's political, not his religious, faith. Suppose the foreign head of an American denomination preached

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

the principles of Bolshevism. If a member of that church ran for United States Senator, could he fairly resent an inquiry as to his position on Bolshevism by objecting that his religious faith was being attacked? Instead of being a bigot for questioning the political beliefs of a candidate, may it not be that the bigotry lies in resenting the questions on the ground that they are religious? By resenting them, one really tries to impose his religion on others, to insist that because Catholics call certain questions religious which the rest of us call political, the rest of us must accept the Catholic definition of them as religious.

Governor Smith flatly and finely said that he did reject the teachings of the popes, that he did believe in the separation of the church and state and that he did believe in the public schools.

But surely it is not contentious to remain of the opinion that the church teaches all the doctrines which he rejects.

In his reply to Governor Smith, Mr. Marshall quoted from a book by John Joseph McVey, published last in 1926, under the imprimatur of Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia. It is entitled a *Manual of Christian Doctrine*. A series of questions and answers by teacher and pupil are given as follows:

Question: In what order or respect is the State subordinate to the (Roman Catholic) Church?

Answer: In the spiritual order and in all things referring to that order.

Question: What right has the Pope in virtue of this supremacy?

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Answer: The right to annul those laws or acts of Government that would injure the salvation of souls or attack the natural rights of citizens.

Question: What more should the State do than protect the rights and the liberty of the (Roman Catholic) Church?

Answer: The State should also aid, protect and defend the (Roman Catholic) Church.

Question: What then is the principal obligation of heads of states?

Answer: Their principal obligation is to practise the (Roman Catholic) religion themselves, and as they are in power, to protect and defend it.

Question: Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?

Answer: Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation, and for that of the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

Question: When may the State tolerate dissenting worship?

Answer: When these worships have acquired a sort of legal existence consecrated by time and accorded by treaties or covenants.

Question: May the State separate itself from the (Roman Catholic) Church?

Answer: No, because it may not withdraw from the Supreme Law of Christ.

Question: What name is given to the doctrine that the State has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the (Roman Catholic) Church to protect it?

Answer: This doctrine is called Liberalism. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press.

Question: Why is Liberalism to be condemned?

Answer: Because it denies all subordination of the State

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

to the (Roman Catholic) Church; because it despises the social domination of Christ and rejects the benefits derived therefrom.³⁰

Governor Smith made no reply to this letter, and Father Duffy, who assisted the Governor in his answer to Mr. Marshall's first letter, merely said that McVey's book was not common teaching in American Catholic schools and that it was used only to a very limited extent. But Mr. Marshall stated that it had gone into forty-eight editions, and above all that it was issued under the authority of an American Cardinal.

In the *Forum* for October and November, 1925, Mrs. Kate Sargent published two articles entitled, "Catholicism in Massachusetts." In the October number she quoted from a paper by the Reverend John J. Graham, I.P.P., read at the annual fall conference of the Senior Clergy at Cathedral Hall, Boston, and published in the *Pilot*, the official organ of the Boston Catholic Diocese, October 25, 1924.

He outlined the beliefs of the Masonic order in these words:

They hold that all men have the same rights and are in every respect of equal and like condition; that each one is naturally free; that no one has the right to command another; that it is an act of violence to require men to obey any authority than that which is ordained from themselves.

Then Mr. Graham comments:

According to this, therefore, all things belong to the free people; power is held by the command of the people so that,

³⁰ *New York Times*, April 18, 1927.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

when the popular will changes, rulers may be lawfully deposed. The source of all rights and civil duties is either in the multitude or in the governing authority when this is constituted according to the latest doctrines. It is held also that the State should be without God; that in the various forms of religion there is no reason why one should take precedence of another; and that they are all to occupy the same place. For some time past they have openly endeavored to bring this about with all their strength and resources. Should this be accomplished, there will surely be an indifference to all religion, which means its destruction, the destruction of every distinction of rank and property, and the overthrow of society as at present constituted.

Yet as Mrs. Sargent says, the principles so bitterly condemned by Mr. Graham are simply those of the American commonwealth.

It would seem that Mr. Marshall was quite justified in stating that the principles Governor Smith rejected were the "universal, organized, constant teaching of the Roman Catholic Church."

Governor Smith believes in the public schools, but the church has a rule requiring attendance at the parochial schools.

Moreover, many Catholics, even when they repudiate the teachings of the church, subconsciously retain feelings that certain questions are religious which the overwhelming majority of Americans would unhesitatingly call political. Their instincts cause them to confuse church and state, even when their sincerely expressed convictions declare that there is a difference. They retain a clannish way of

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

thinking which time and again leads them to make a religious issue when there is none.

Mrs. Sargent states that in 1919, as a result of a long investigation by a special committee which studied the educational needs of the state, seventeen separate bills were introduced in the General Court. A storm of Roman Catholic opposition broke out. A deluge of circular letters signed by school children and their parents poured in on the legislators. The opposition centered on three bills—one providing for the establishment and distribution of a state fund for education, one imposing a penalty on those cities and towns which failed to comply with the state education laws, and one requiring compulsory physical training in all schools.

The first was designed to equalize salaries so that children in the poorer communities "might have the same advantages as those in richer cities and towns." The second was designed to keep schools in all districts up to the mark, to see that all required instruction was given, among others instruction in the English language. It provided that cities and towns which did not comply with all the school laws should forfeit their "share of the school fund until they did comply." It was bitterly fought on the ground that it was an interference with private schools and that the existing laws were adequate. Among such laws, in addition to the requirement as to English, was that any child who did not receive private instruction approved by the public authorities, would not be excused from public school attendance. The third bill,

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

providing for compulsory physical instruction, was bitterly attacked as a measure for teaching sex hygiene.³¹

The school fund bills were passed; the physical education bill was first defeated and later adopted in a modified form.

The opposition was most bitter and determined, and the advocates of the bills failed to get any adequate newspaper publicity for their case.

Mrs. Sargent also quoted from a speech by Cardinal O'Connell in 1919, in which he attacked as undesirable state activities, medical inspection in schools, the supplying of food for poor pupils, and free dispensary treatment.

H. H. Kohlsaatt, in his *Memoirs*, tells of an incident in the settlement of the friars' claims in the Philippines. Roosevelt had reports to the effect that the friars were grossly dissolute and corrupt, that they kept concubines and slaves and that there was no chance for progress in the Philippines until they were out of the islands. John D. Crimmins, an Irish Catholic of charm and ability, came to him and with heat told him he would lose every Catholic vote in the country if he carried out his policy. Roosevelt appointed a Catholic chaplain to investigate and report to him. He reported that conditions were blacker than first painted. In the end, the friars' lands were bought by an amicable agreement and the friars left the Islands.³²

³¹ *Forum*, November, 1925.

³² Kohlsaatt, *From McKinley to Harding*, p. 111.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

In 1916 Mayor Mitchel of New York, himself a Catholic and a grandson of an Irish Revolutionist, was bitterly attacked by prominent representatives of the Catholic Church because he wished to take away the public funds from certain Catholic and Protestant children's institutions which he deemed improperly run. He said:

For three years and a half I have been endeavoring to secure humane treatment and proper care for the 22,000 homeless and dependent children committed as wards to private charitable institutions. I have been endeavoring to secure proper administration of the \$5,000,000 of public funds actually disbursed to these institutions for the care of the City's wards.

He declared that

in some of these institutions of all denominations children were found with their hair covered with lice, their scalps covered with itching sores, their bodies covered with filthy clothes that had not been changed for three weeks, their bodies underfed and undernourished, deprived of any reasonable opportunity for recreation, compelled to sit on backless wooden benches, some of them compelled to bathe ten, fifteen or twenty-five standing in a trough of six inches of water, many of them compelled to use the same towel after bathing and other kindred conditions.

His attempt raised a tempest. A Catholic chancellor of the archdiocese led the attack. Mitchel was subjected to the grossest abuse, he was called a recreant Catholic, he was threatened with political ruin if he continued in his course. His Commissioner of Charities and his attorney were actually indicted for wiretapping the rooms of the chancellor. The attack

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

on him was made a religious issue. It was the old clannish attempt to make a group or church issue out of a question of efficiency and decency.

Mitchel declared that:

there was a conspiracy in my opinion on the part of certain clergymen and laymen to obstruct the due administration of the laws, to interfere with government—in short, religious interference with the government of this city which is a thing, I think, contrary to the genius of American institutions because if there is one thing that is a fundamental of ours in American life it is that just as we declare that government shall not lay its hands upon the altar of the Church, so the Church shall not lay its hand upon the altar of the government.³³

Another illustration was given us recently in the Knights of Columbus' protest over the Calles program in Mexico. Governor Smith's answer stated that the Catholic Church was opposed to intervention in Mexico. But the Knights of Columbus demanded it. The Knights in their annual convention in Philadelphia passed a resolution on August 5, 1926, stating that:

all this system in Mexico has been created under American auspices, sustained by American executive authority, which in the first place, while refusing to recognize Lenin, and Trotsky, has by executive order of recognition, accepted Calles and Obregon who are enthusiastic supporters of the Bolshevik conception of government.

We further point to the significance of the patronage bestowed upon these military despots by the continuance of such recognition and particularly by the discriminating favoritism

³³ *Literary Digest*, Vol. 52, p. 1621. June 3, 1916.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

shown to Calles by the continuance of the embargo, which makes the Calles ascendancy possible.

We call upon the President and the State Department to put an end to this ignominious contempt which has been shown by Calles for Americans' appeal and to resolutely demand protection for American citizens and that they be treated with the same consideration and respect which are shown to Mexican citizens in this country.

The resolution ended:

We, as American citizens demand of our Government that this action be taken forthwith.³⁴

When the representatives of the Knights had their interview with the President, however, they admitted that they had no evidence of "outrages against American citizens." They then said, too, that they were opposed to intervention in Mexico. They favored "sympathetic action to put an end to conditions there."

It is fair to conclude that the action of the Knights was not provoked by violation of American rights. It was provoked by an attack on their church, in another country. The demand was made as Catholics, and not as Americans.

Mr. Stanley Frost, in an article in the *Forum* for October, 1926, vividly set down some of the reflections that came to Americans of the old stock as they watched the Catholic ceremonies at the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago in June, 1926. The whole thing, he well said, seemed strangely alien to America. The

³⁴ *New York Times*, August 6, 11 and September 2, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

kissing of rings, the obeisance in the streets to cardinals and the symbols of the faith, the public exhibitions of exaltation, the mass performances, while beautiful, all were not a part of the somewhat dour but self-reliant, independent, American spirit.

The *New York Times*, in an editorial highly praising Governor Smith's reply, said that he had

set his foot upon a hideous prejudice, a slimy and un-American superstition, which has been threatening to dominate our public life, but which after this will scarcely dare to raise its head in the open.³⁵

Truly these are strange and ill-considered words. Knowing the force of authority in the Catholic Church and reading the words in McVey's book and the words of the Reverend J. J. Graham, how can it be said to be a superstition that the Catholic Church and hosts of its followers in the United States do not accept American principles of government? But the *Times* goes on to admit that

sometimes, in some dioceses, the influence of certain priests and prelates has been used in politics. But the same is true of Methodists and Baptists, for example. It is true of them at this moment. If it is abhorrent for Catholics to be told by their spiritual rulers how they ought to vote, it is no less abhorrent for Methodist Bishops to attempt to control the political activity of the communicants of their Church. Neither ought to be heard of in free America. Both go counter to the Constitution of the United States. Both should be banished from our public life.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, April 18, 1927.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Here is surely a chaotic condition of thought. Since when has it become "abhorrent," as the *Times* says, for priests and ministers and bishops to have political opinions and to express them? Does the *Times* intend to advocate the doctrine that the preacher must merely preach Scripture and not apply it to the life about him? In 1896 Archbishop Ireland issued a strong statement in favor of McKinley and the gold standard. This was an entirely proper act. Bishops and ministers are not any more than judges, in the words of the Supreme Court, "amorphous mummies." They have a right to express themselves on free silver, and child labor, and the twelve-hour day, the World Court and the League of Nations. But we ask that they act in politics as Americans and not as churchmen. We ask above all that they do not act in politics to strengthen the position of their church, that they do not make political questions religious, nor religious questions political, and that they recognize the supremacy of the state in all things political. Like Mr. Marshall, I know of no Protestant church that seeks to have the state especially protect it, that denies the separation of church and state, or that uses authority to control the activity of its members. So far as I am aware, the only Protestant sect which commands attendance of the children of its communicants at its parochial schools is the German Lutheran, and it is not numerically significant. I know of no Protestant sect many of whose members think and vote as groups. There is no Methodist nor Baptist nor Presbyterian vote

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that votes for Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians as such, or acts in politics to strengthen or protect their denominations. And since the Protestant sects have no foreign connections, perforce they do not react to foreign controversies in this country.

Governor Smith's answer was not only a credit to him, but a great triumph for the American democracy, for it showed that with him the power of its great ideals is greater than the power of the teachings of the church. But many of us must perforce question whether the process which has gone on with him must not go on for some time to come with millions of humbler communicants who undoubtedly still accept authority, and whether it is the part of wisdom to allow the influx of immigrants with alien ideas of the state to come in such numbers that they become the majority.

It is but the truth that all over the country men and women, sometimes of humble education and narrow experience but of high ideals and deep roots in our past, with honored American traditions running through their families for generations, have felt a strange, almost inarticulate sense of foreboding that strange ways of thought were pressing in upon them, working a slow and subtle and to them disastrous change in their country's character. Treating of things as they are, let us not forget how deep-seated is the Puritan prejudice against "Popery" and all its ways in the old stock of this country. It has been handed down for three hundred years in millions of families, it has been taught from simple country pul-

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

pits for ten generations. This tradition may be narrow and sometimes intolerant, but it is held by people of worthy character, of deep convictions—men and women of independent and self-reliant nature, dour sometimes and opposed to show and spectacle, but loyal and deeply, unconsciously patriotic—men and women who in every crisis have done their share of the nation's work.

* To them the question is not one of tolerance of a minority. They have felt that the time was imminent when the old minority, with its power and organization, might become the majority. They have felt uneasily an alien force taking over the country.

It can hardly be doubted that if England's Protestant population, with its deep-rooted, nonconformist history, saw its 2,000,000 Catholic population grow in two generations by alien influx so that it was twice as great as the largest Protestant sect, it would have been filled with anxious doubts and forebodings. One of the main reasons for the final separation of Belgium and Holland was that one country was Catholic and the other Protestant. We cannot escape the conclusion that grave dissension and even political confusion and political disintegration have resulted in our country through the too rapid growth of what is to the mass of our population an alien and certainly a diverse religion. The present situation of the Democratic party is a striking illustration of this disintegration and confusion. The convention of 1924 was bitterly and fatally split on the basis of religion, and there is every prospect that that of 1928

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

will be likewise so split. The political future of the Democratic party is actually threatened by this fatal internal split.

Entirely apart from all questions of the merit of religious beliefs, it is certainly open to question whether it is a healthy thing for any country to see its dominant religious feeling submerged in two or three generations and replaced by one with a foreign basis, and it is certain the masses will not see it happen without protest, active and even violent.

✧ But the fear of an alien religious control is not the dominant one that disturbs the Americans of the old stock. The alien religious psychology, the alien control, are only the most obvious divergent assets on which the average mind seizes. Deeper than that is the sense of the different emotions and psychology of the newer peoples who are loyal to the alien control and are accustomed to submit to authority in the determination of any of their opinions. There is abundant evidence that all over the country there has been a restless, inarticulate feeling among the old native stock that they, the descendants of those who founded the country, who largely fought the Revolution, made the Middle West, and saved the Union, were gradually, remorselessly being pushed out of their own land and that aliens were taking it over.

Here again, the chief cause of trouble is that mass immigration brings changes too rapidly and artificially. National changes should be slow and gradual. If immigration came slowly, not only could the immigrants acquire the native background without

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

antagonizing the native stock, but the native stock could learn the merits and worth of the immigrants without there being engendered those bitter antagonisms which are inevitable whenever immigrants come and remain in separate groups.

Looking at things as they are, one cannot fail to see that great and continuous discord lies in front of us if the rapid and unhealthy change of our population is not arrested, and the country is not maintained in its historic political psychology, for the uneasy foreboding of a large part of our Protestant population is founded on real things and cannot be lightly sneered away.

(c) *Jewish Isolation*

The effect of the Jew on our social solidarity cannot be ignored. It is difficult to put one's finger on specific instances of the clash between the Jew and the rest of our population. Yet the facts are known to every schoolboy. Nowhere better is it seen than in our colleges. It is notorious that the Jew is, generally speaking, denied admission to college fraternities and clubs and to most city clubs. In every college where his number is great, he is a problem. Four years ago Harvard frankly proposed to limit the proportion of Jews to be admitted. The plan aroused much criticism and was given up, but the problem of the isolation of the Jew, and the unhappy division of the student body between Jew and Gentile, remained. The Jew is largely a race apart, an alien in our midst. This may be the fault of the Gen-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

tile. Again I refuse to be drawn into debates of right and wrong. I say that the condition exists, that the Jew in numbers is always isolated, that he produces a tragic separation of the student body, and that no argument or scolding can change the matter. It can only be worn away by time, by slow processes of amelioration. But meanwhile, it were folly to increase the problem by increasing the groups of separated Jews. Indeed, it is an injustice both to the Jew and to the Gentile to increase the friction by increasing the numbers of the Jews in this country, for racial prejudice increases with numbers by a sort of geometrical proportion.

Partly because of his isolation, partly because of the very prejudice against him, many Jews have developed traits which mark them apart. The tragic wandering of the Jews, of many lands and yet of no land, has made many of them distinctly lacking in loyalty to communities. This is, of course, not true of large numbers who are filled with a fine sentiment for their native or adopted countries, but it cannot be denied that the international Jew, the Jew who is, as the French say, *déraciné* or rather *unraciné*, is a distinct and largely existing type. Many Jews from Poland and Russia display, too, a fierce individualism quite incompatible with the orderly life of a democracy.

(d) *The Effect of Racial Heterogeneity on Law*

This diversity of standards and traditions, which we have been analyzing, in the non-political fields of

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

our life, operates to prevent the wholesome development of our national life on its cultural side. I believe that it has much to do with the development and the enforcement of law in the United States. Law is founded in the beginning on custom. The common law finds in custom its greatest and surest source. When races are diverse custom cannot develop, and the result is either to leave certain fields uncovered by the law, or, as was true in England and France, to have different customs enforced for different races in the same country. Even when law is made by the legislature, it cannot be enforced unless the habits and customs of the people will support it. The prohibition law is the trite but unmistakable proof of this principle. In the long run, of course, law is what is enforced by juries and courts, and when juries will not convict for violation of a certain law, in effect that law no longer runs in that community.

Now in the United States we have many racial groups whose experience does not support our laws. Some South Italians and Sicilians, for example, look on law and its enforcement as something alien to them. The conspiracy of silence which meets the attempt to unravel some shocking murder is evidence of a social heritage entirely different from ours. Partly the refusal to testify is due to fear, but a large element in the recalcitrance is due to an alien attitude towards the law.

Moreover, the juries in our large cities, with their varying backgrounds, cannot have the same coherent

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

reaction that juries in like-minded communities have. Some jurors respond to some standards and some utterly fail to feel the same emotions. Religious differences even enter into the verdicts of jurors. A juror who served on a jury which tried a boy of seventeen for embezzlement of over a hundred thousand dollars' worth of securities, stated that of the twelve jurors, seven Protestants voted one way and five Catholics the other. The trial ended in a disagreement.

One who lives in Chicago is constantly and disquietingly impressed with the heterogeneity of its population, its confused response to the shocking series of gunman murders that have occurred there in the past few years, and he is forced to the unwelcome conclusion that the opinion of the community is too unformed and chaotic to focus itself on the prevention or the punishment of crime.

The Chicago *Daily News* last year asked four prominent police chiefs to give their views of the causes of the excess of crime in the United States. They gave various reasons—the free use of firearms, the failure of the public to co-operate with the police, the laxity of the courts. Several of these reasons it will be seen can be traced back to the lack of a uniform opinion on crime and its punishment. But one chief directly stated that the diversity of our population was one of the causes of our trouble. President Johann Schober of the Vienna police said:

For one thing the nations of Europe are made up of homogeneous peoples. We are either Germans or Austrians or

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Slavs. . . . America is entirely different. You are made up of every nationality under the sun. There are Germans and Austrians and Slavs and Latins all mixed up together. . . . I wonder if this race mixture does not have a great deal to do with your amount of crime.³⁶

Chief Justice Taft came to the same conclusion. In attempting to find the cause, he said:

Well, of course, there should be a premise that we have a different set of criminals to deal with and we have problems growing out of our 'melting pot' that a population like that of England—homogeneous—doesn't present.

The law abiding impulse of the English people is most remarkable, and it was manifested in the late strike, for it controlled the strikers themselves so that in that tense situation there wasn't, as I recollect it, any disorder resulting in death.

That couldn't have happened in our congested population of non-native races that are not imbued with that respect for law that is possible among a homogeneous people.

So it is that our machinery for the arrest and prosecution of criminals is confronted with obstacles in the character of the peoples themselves, that no other country has.³⁷

(e) *Heterogeneity and Literature*

But our heterogeneity thwarts the finest and sweetest development of our national life. I realize that I am getting on debatable ground when I say that art and literature themselves depend on a common tradition and a common background for their best fruition, but I believe it is so. A nation to produce great

³⁶ Chicago *Daily News*, August 4, 1925.

³⁷ Chicago *Tribune*, August 22, 1926.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

literature must have a community of feeling, a common experience that wells up in and out of its poets and dramatists. A common feeling, a like-mindedness, is required both by the writers themselves and by the audience that inspires and enjoys them.

It will be said that all great literature is universal, in a true sense spaceless and timeless, international or at least of no nation but all nations. Americans enjoy Dickens and Thackeray, Hugo and Anatole France, Dante and Fogazzaro, Tolstoy and Turgenieff, Molière and Homer, Cervantes and Euripides.

The human characteristics that great novelists and dramatists depict *are* universal. An American can understand Micawber or Père Grandet, the disloyalty of Regan, and the grief of Lear. The motives which novelists and dramatists delineate are universal. Hatred, rage, revenge, love, jealousy, pettiness, loyalty, gentleness—they are indeed spaceless and timeless; they are shown in Balzac and Thackeray, in Hardy and Manzoni. But the setting, the milieu, the characters, are not universal. They are all particular. Pickwick was an Englishman, Goriot a Frenchman, Newcombe an Englishman. No one but an Englishman could have drawn Pickwick or Newcombe, no one but a Frenchman could have drawn Grandet or Goriot or Monsieur Bergeret. Rage, jealousy, love and hate are universal, but the manner in which these elemental passions manifest themselves is always special and particular. No one can portray a character unless he knows people from whom the character is drawn. Only by knowing his

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

people, only by knowing them as he knows himself, can he make them speak and act. Hardy knows his people. He is part of them and they are part of him. Dostoevsky knew his people. But it would have been folly for Hardy to try to write a novel of Dostoevsky's people. It would have been folly for Dostoevsky to try to write a novel of Hardy's people.

How much more impossible, then, would it be for a New Yorker to write a novel of people of twenty different backgrounds? He would not know them well enough to make them talk. He may get off into the Ghetto and study the types so that he can write of them a short story that is real. So long as their lives do not cross into another racial group he might, through intensive study, learn to know them well enough to carry them through a longer study. But once their lives began to cross over into and interlace with other racial groups, he would be lost. He could not know all the racial groups and soon he would perforce be writing from his brain and not from life.

Is it a mere accident that no noteworthy novels come out of New York, save the highly specialized novels of Edith Wharton, which treat of a narrow and exotic, if homogeneous, society, and that since New England became conglomerate in population it became creatively sterile? Is it a mere accident that such worthy recent novels as we have, those of Willa Cather, Booth Tarkington, Henry Sydnor Harrison, and Herbert Quick, have come from people who have lived their youth and even, some of them, their

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

mature days in communities coherent enough for them to understand?

I believe it is not an accident. All great novels are provincial in the sense that the characters and the stage are limited, local and uniform enough for the novelist to know and understand them.

To know his people, to know the locality, the novelist must moreover know their past. The past, its traditions and sufferings, its deep emotions, well up in all great literature. It cannot well up when the past itself is confused and discordant. One cannot read a page of Hardy without feeling how all the past of his sacred Wessex broods over his people. The farms of old Wessex, the Roman ruins, the druids, the Saxon May-pole, the old hearty Merrie England, the potent force of centuries, move through him as he thinks and writes.

Not only does heterogeneity stifle the writer and dull his powers, but it robs him of his audience. Men do not write in a vacuum. The applause of their people stimulates and drives them on. Raw communities, we say, are too busy to write great literature. But even raw communities have their creative souls. But they get no attention, they have no audience, they get no applause, they go where they can get it. The audience makes literature. But our American audience is diverse and confused. How different was that of Athens! The Athenian people of the time of Pericles was an enormous stimulus to Æschylus and Sophocles. So was the English people of the time of Elizabeth to those of the Mermaid Tavern.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

Moreover, all great literature has been produced in times of great unity of spirit by men in whom the community of feeling of the people ran full and strong, when the common emotions of the people spoke greatly through their men of genius. Literature arises from the people, from the roots, from the past. It is nothing manufactured. It is no hothouse product. Genius does not write an epic by ostracizing itself from mankind and resolving to write something great. It does not draw its inspiration from itself; it draws it from the ideals and the passions of its people. Funck-Brentano, whom I have quoted so freely in the chapter on "The Making of Nations," referred to the artificiality of the literature of Gaul, in the time of the Romans, the lack of originality of her writers. And he gave the reason. "Writers," he said, "can only express the sentiments and emotions which awaken interest, if they draw them from the depths of their being, and they can feel emotions worthy of holding attention only by sinking their roots in the most profound traditions of the race and of the native soil."³⁸

Some eighteen years ago Bliss Perry wrote a magnificent answer to the claim that America was producing a great literature. He commented on the statement of Henry M. Alden, whom he was answering, that it "is in magazine writing that our break with the past is most complete."

"Precisely, one may rejoin," he said, "and it is for this reason that the new Literature conveys such an

³⁸ Funck-Brentano, *Les origines*, p. 154.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

impression of fragmentariness, of evanescence. This is one of the most startling of its defects. The strain of continuity, so rich in manifold associations of racial and national experience has been deflected—wasted. A hybrid cosmopolitanism has entertained us with novel experiments of sensation.”

He said that great poetry was the overflow of the spirit of a people. The poet catches the great longings and dreams of his time.

The poet, [he said], does not create these national convictions. He rests back on them, he is borne up and onwards by them, as a swimmer yields himself to the surf. So Sophocles wrote in the glorious hour of Greek freedom and faith, so wrote in flame and music the believing Florentine, so wrote the great Elizabethans and the Frenchmen of the Court of Louis the 14th; in the strength of a new hope for our old humanity; so wrote the young Wordsworth and Coleridge before the Revolution, and the forever young Byron and Shelley after it; so wrote Emerson in the serene optimism of the Concord Hymn, and Lowell in the poignant sorrow, the passionate exaltation of the Commemoration Ode. Poetry like this cannot be written by wanting to write it. It is the spontaneous overflow of a national vitality. . . . But the time for that unification of feeling so essential to the life of national poetry has apparently not yet come. We must wait perhaps for a still deeper community of feeling, for the growth of a more distinct conception of American national ideals and of the relation of these ideals to civilization.³⁹

The great dreams cannot come from a divided people. They are not the product of far-flung and diverse civilizations. The warmth and unity of co-

³⁹ Bliss Perry, "The New Literature," *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1908.

THE INTERNAL RESULTS OF HETEROGENEITY

herent communities nourish them. The varied glitter of cosmopolitan societies stifles them. A continent does not produce art, or literature, or law. It does not produce that sweet like-mindedness, which comforts and sustains us.

CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSION

I. THE EXTENT OF THE DISINTEGRATION

WE SAW that the friends of the immigrant declare that we are in the melting-pot as well as the immigrant. We now see that they are right. But our conclusions are different. They declare because we are all in the melting-pot together, and we as well as they must be modified, that the American tradition should be abandoned. We say that the American tradition can be saved if immigration is severely restricted from now on. But in any event it is clear that we shall be modified. The modification, of course, will be much less if the old stock stays fifty percent of the total as it now is, than if it falls to twenty percent. If the ratio of strength remains as it now is, we shall be modified much less than the immigrants, both because our numbers are greater and because our institutions give us an advantage. But modified we shall be in race, in language, in political habits, in customs and traditions, as surely as night follows day. Our national tradition is blurred even with those who cherish it strongly, by the presence all about them of the alien-minded to whom it means little. Our very accents are molded by those about us. Even if immigration were stopped to-day, the modification would be serious enough. If free immigration were allowed

CONCLUSION

to begin again and to continue, the modification will in the end be well-nigh complete. The America of the year 2000 with eighty percent of our people South or East European in origin would be unrecognizable by the America of to-day.

The evidence presented in this book shows clearly, I think, how far disintegration had already set in and what further confusion and disintegration faced us if we continued our historic policy of allowing immigration to come at the rate of a million and a half or two millions a year until the limit of population was reached. We saw immigrants coming, not as individuals but as groups, to join groups already here and to perpetuate those groups by the very fact of their own newness. We saw the possibility that numbers would pour in on us so overwhelmingly that our population, which traces back to the Revolution, might, in a hundred years more, be less than twenty percent of the total. We saw political disunion already upon us, and social disunion growing apace. The finest fruits of organized society—an ordered politics, a coherent national policy abroad, the development of our law and literature—all were threatened by our rising heterogeneity. In short, we faced the possibility that Mr. Lippmann's statement that the tradition of the Puritan could not unite us, would be true. When that time comes we shall not be a nation, and we should not become a nation until, after many generations, a new fusion should be attained.

This is not to say that after those many generations a new nation would not be achieved. Its

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

achievement, of course, would be in the hands of fate. But as after the Dark Ages of racial mixture, far less extensive than ours would be, new nations emerged in Europe, so after the dark ages of our mingling of races, after Zangwill's centuries-long melting-pot, a new nation might be achieved. But who wants a dark age of confusion if he can avoid it? Who wants to destroy a magnificent organization on the possibility that centuries later another one, perhaps as good, might be achieved? We have a nation now. We can still keep it. We can keep it by maintaining the old stock in no worse condition than it is in at present. Certainly any nation, more than fifty percent of whose population has roots less than one hundred and thirty-five years deep in this country, is in danger, but certainly there is still every reason to believe that by preventing that percentage from increasing our essential unity can be maintained. The disintegration has not yet gone too far. The force of native tradition still controls, still animates our national spirit, though only after delay and turmoil, with the beautiful heritage of our past.

2. THE ACT OF 1924 AS A REMEDY

The essential thing is to keep in the majority the stock to whom our institutions are native, or at least give it a chance to remain in the majority. The Act of 1924 seeks to attain this end—first, by limiting immigration to reasonable and workable proportions to prevent it coming in unwieldy masses, namely, that immigration outside of North America shall be lim-

CONCLUSION

ited each year to two percent of the foreign-born population here in 1890. Without that restriction, there is no telling what numbers we might have had. It may be one-fourth or one-fifth of the immigration we would have had with no such bar in effect. The Act of 1924 aims, therefore, to give the native stock a chance. It gives it a chance to maintain its strength, it relieves it from unfair competition. It gives it a chance to teach the immigrant our ways. With immigration of one or two million a year we would be totally unable either to maintain our ratio to the total population, or to do justice to the immigrant.

The Act of 1924 seeks to attain this end, second, by limiting the immigration from any one country temporarily to 2% of the persons born in that country living here in 1890, and after 1927 to its proportion of 150,000 on the origin basis. The quota system reduces the recruitment of alien groups, for it is when aliens come in large numbers that they form and maintain groups. The restriction in the number coming to each racial group will tend to undermine the alien groups already here, for hyphenated groups will be fighting a losing battle if they do not receive large enlistments from abroad. The constant streams of new arrivals increase the power of alien groups not only by their own numbers but by the enormous effect they have in maintaining the native spirit in those already here.

The reason for adopting the 1890 basis for quotas until the origins figures would be really is well known. The foreign-born living here in 1920 con-

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

tained a percentage of southern and eastern Europeans entirely out of proportion to their ratio to our entire population. The 1890 figures, while not representative of the actual content of our total population, were far more nearly so than those of 1920. To base the quotas on the 1920 census means that South and East Europeans would be preferred simply because of late years they have come in larger numbers than those from the North and West.

3. THE NATIONAL ORIGINS PLAN OF RESTRICTION

The national origins provision alone, however, strikes at the desirable basis. It says that if 10 percent of the total population traces back to Germany, then 10 percent of our immigration shall be from Germany; if 3 percent traces to Italy, then 3 percent of our immigration shall be from Italy. This is much fairer than to say that because 3 percent of our foreign-born in 1890 was from Italy, then 3 percent of our immigration shall be from Italy. The base should be the total population and not the foreign-born. Our country is filling up. It may be one hundred and fifteen million now. Its limit may be only one hundred and ninety-seven millions. It is entirely reasonable to say, then, that it should be filled up on the basis of our present content.

It will be seen from the table on page 401 that under the Presidential Commission's national origins quotas, Great Britain and North Ireland will be allowed 48.69% of our quota immigration; Germany, 15.6%; the Irish Free State, 9.2%; Sweden, 2.1%;

CONCLUSION

Country of origin	Provisional quotas on basis of national origin ¹	Present quotas based on 1890 foreign- born population	Estimated quotas on national origin basis as submitted to Congress in 1924 ²
Total.....	153,541	164,667	150,000 ³
Afghanistan.....	100	100	
Albania.....	100	100	100
Andorra.....	100	100	100
Arabian peninsula.....	100	100	
Armenia.....		124	100
Australia, etc.....	100	121	100
Austria.....	1,486	785	2,171
Belgium.....	410	512	251
Bhutan.....	100	100	
Bulgaria.....	100	100	100
Cameroon (British).....	100	100	
Cameroon (French).....	100	100	
China.....	100	100	
Czechoslovakia.....	2,248	3,073	1,359
Danzig.....	122	228	100
Denmark.....	1,044	2,789	945
Egypt.....	100	100	100
Estonia.....	109	124	325
Ethiopia (Abyssinia).....	100	100	100
Finland.....	559	471	517
France.....	3,837	3,954	1,772
Germany.....	23,428	51,227	20,028
Great Britain and Northern Ireland...	73,039	34,007	85,135
Greece.....	367	100	384
Hungary.....	967	473	1,521
Iceland.....	100	100	100
India.....	100	100	
Iraq (Mesopotamia).....	100	100	
Irish Free State.....	13,862	28,567	8,330
Italy, etc.....	6,091	3,845	5,716
Japan.....	100	100	
Latvia.....	184	142	384
Liberia.....	100	100	100

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Country of origin	Provisional quotas on basis of national origin ¹	Present quotas based on 1890 foreign-born population	Estimated quotas on national origin basis as submitted to Congress in 1924 ²
Liechtenstein.....	100	100	100
Lithuania.....	494	344	458
Luxemburg.....	100	100	100
Monaco.....	100	100	100
Morocco.....	100	100	100
Muscat (Oman).....	100	100	
Nauru.....	100	100	
Nepal.....	100	100	
Netherlands.....	2,421	1,648	2,762
New Zealand, etc.....	100	100	100
Norway.....	2,267	6,453	2,053
New Guinea, etc.....	100	100	
Palestine.....	100	100	100
Persia.....	100	100	100
Poland.....	4,978	5,982	4,535
Portugal.....	290	503	236
Ruanda and Urundi.....	100	100	
Rumania.....	516	603	222
Russia.....	4,781	2,248	4,002
Samoa, western.....	100	100	
San Marino.....	100	100	100
Siam.....	100	100	
South Africa, Union of.....	100	100	100
South West Africa.....	100	100	
Spain.....	674	131	148
Sweden.....	3,259	9,561	3,072
Switzerland.....	1,198	2,081	783
Syria and the Lebanon.....	100	100	100
Tanganyika.....	100	100	
Togoland (British).....	100	100	
Togoland (French).....	100	100	
Turkey.....	233	100	100
Yap, etc.....	100	100	
Yugoslavia.....	777	671	591 ⁴

¹ Presidential Commission. ² Captain Trevor. ³ Includes Fiume (100) and Hejaz (100). ⁴ Congressional Record, January 7, 1927.

CONCLUSION

Norway, 1.5% ; Italy, 4%. The result is to increase the British quota from 34,007 to 73,039, and to decrease the German quota from 51,227 to 23,428, and the Irish quota from 28,567 to 13,862.

The table presented by the Commission is shown on page 385.

4. THE ATTACK ON THE ORIGINS PLAN

Secretaries Kellogg, Hoover and Davis, constituting the Presidential Commission designated by the Act of 1924 to prepare the origins quota estimates presented their report with the statement that

while it is stated to be a preliminary report, yet it is believed that further investigation will not substantially alter the conclusions arrived at.

It may be stated that the statistical and historical information available from which these computations were made is not entirely satisfactory. Assuming, however, that the issuance of the proclamation provided for in paragraph (3), section 11, of said act is mandatory and that Congress will neither repeal nor amend said act on or before April 1, 1927, the attached list shows substantially the quota allotments for use in said proclamation.

The three Secretaries evidently became dissatisfied with even this statement, and seven days later another letter of theirs of the same date as the first was transmitted by the President to Congress to take the place of the first. The last paragraph of the first letter was changed in the second to read as follows:

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Although this is the best information we have been able to secure, we wish to call attention to the reservations made by the committee and to state that in our opinion the statistical and historical information available raises grave doubts as to the whole value of these computations as a basis for the purposes intended. We therefore can not assume responsibility for such conclusions under these circumstances.

There is still a third published version of this letter. Its phrasing seems to have worried the three secretaries considerably.

The origins basis was at once the center of bitter attacks. For some time alien blocs had been conducting a campaign against the origins basis which they assumed would be unfavorable to them. In the summer and fall of 1926 they had carried their objections to many Congressmen and Senators.

The fact that Great Britain and North Ireland would receive one-half of our immigration aroused great bitterness on the part of our alien blocs, and, on the other hand, because of the very lack of group feeling among the British stock it did not cause any organized agitation on behalf of those of British descent. Partly the criticism is due to the simple fact that alien blocs are fighting simply for their own nationalities and are more vocal than those who have been here some time. Partly the criticism is based on the evident and incontrovertible fact that no one can tell exactly what our origins are.

The summary of editorial opinion published in the *Literary Digest* of January 22, 1927, showed much hostile opinion. One newspaper called the origins

CONCLUSION

provision "an ill-considered and indefinite piece of legislation." A leading financial journal called it "slap-dash." A prominent Middle Western newspaper said that "this iniquitous clause should be repealed root and branch."⁵

It is difficult to believe that these editorial critics have studied with any care the question they dismiss so cavalierly.

It is obvious, of course, that the calculation must be estimated. Few of those whose people have been here two or three hundred years know what proportion of their blood is English or Scotch or Irish or Dutch or German. But the theory is sound and it would seem that mere variations in estimates should be ignored for the desirable result. Starting with the 1790 census as a base, it is possible by adding the immigration since arriving and calculating birth- and death-rates to gauge with reasonable accuracy what percentage of our 1920 population originated in each country.

The method of computation is very complicated. Roughly speaking, it starts off by taking the population of 1920 and finding how many had native grandparents. Then it ascertains how many of those grandparents had native grandparents. By this process it is ascertained that 41,288,570 persons trace back to the 1790 population. Now the Census Bureau in 1909 made an elaborate study of that census. It studied the names (first and surnames), and by considering localities it classified the names by races. On page 91

⁵ *Literary Digest*, January 22, 1927.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

are given the results. The Presidential Commission then split up the figure of 41,288,570 on the basis of the above percentages.

The remainder of the white population is 53,432,345. Part of this consisted of immigrants themselves, namely, 13,712,754, which could be directly classified by origin; 19,190,372 were children of immigrants and they, too, have been classified by the census-takers by countries of origin. The grandchildren and later generations of immigrants, 20,629,219, were classified by estimating when their parents came and dividing them on the same basis as their parents. Mr. Hill of the Census Bureau stated, and I think proved, that the chance for appreciable error in classifying the stock which has come since 1790 is slight and, indeed, there has been no criticism of these estimates.

The objection is to the use of the 1790 base for division of the 41,288,570 descended from the 1790 stock. The Census Bureau took the names reported in that census and classified them by national origins. It is objected that surnames are an uncertain and illusory test of origin. But they were far less uncertain in 1790 than they are to-day. The custom of changing names had little vogue in 1790. Statisticians who have studied the 1790 census are convinced that the 1909 study is substantially accurate. Let us see, then, what objections the alien blocs make to the origins plan.

Various persons of Irish descent object vigorously to the 1790 basis because they claim, for example,

CONCLUSION

that the rolls of Revolutionary soldiers show many more Irish names than are shown on the census records. Thus one objector asserts that, for example, only one Murphy appeared in the census report for Connecticut whereas there were fourteen Murphys in the Revolutionary service. In the first place, the census report named heads of families only, and therefore one head of a family might represent four other persons of the same name. In the second place, the Revolutionary Rolls do not show fourteen Murphys but fourteen references to the name Murphy. There are only six different names used. For example, Thomas Murphy is entered five times, always from East Haddam, and the dates of enlistment do not conflict. A James Murphy from Wethersfield is listed three times and the dates of enlistment do not conflict. A fourth James Murphy is evidently another person. It is probable, therefore, that only seven persons are referred to. Two of these died before the end of the war. One never joined, one enlisted February 1777 and is marked "omitted Aug. 1777," and one deserted and these therefore, may have left the state. Of the rest, one cannot tell how many were heads of families or how many left the state after the war.

It was customary in the Revolutionary War, especially in the beginning, to take enlistments for short periods. Thus a man enlisted for the Lexington alarm, then for six months in 1775, for six months in 1776, in the militia for a few months, and perhaps in 1777 he enlisted for three years or the war, so that

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

many men are listed in the rolls five and six times. The opponents of the origins plan cite many cases of discrepancies between the Revolutionary Rolls and the 1790 census, but it can hardly be doubted that in most cases analysis would show a situation much like that of the Murphys in Connecticut.

Captain Trevor in his testimony before the House Committee in January 1927 gave further evidence to show that the Revolutionary Rolls are worthless for the purpose of discounting the 1790 census. In the first place, there is the obvious fact that the census was nine years after Yorktown. He stated that the records of Massachusetts show that the enlistments, at the average rate of ten names to a page for 16,180 pages, reach a total of 161,800 names, whereas the population of Massachusetts was only 307,000 in 1790. As he concluded: "It is obvious that the duplication of names in the roster is enormous." He noted that an examination of "20 Massachusetts names among those listed by Mr. O'Brien in his comparison of muster roll for 1790 census figures disclose 147 duplications."⁶

Of course, the obvious answer to the statement that the census of 1790 omitted Irish names is that, assuming such errors occurred and even assuming they are numerous, it does not follow that the census reports are vitiated. Some of the professional politicians enjoy believing that the Irish are always discriminated

⁶ Hearings before House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, January 10, 19 and 26, 1927, pp. 36-37. The Mr. O'Brien referred to is Michael J. O'Brien, author of "A Hidden Phase of American History."

CONCLUSION

against, but it is somewhat difficult to assume that the census takers in 1790 foresaw the adoption of the origin system and, being prejudiced against the Irish, left them out of their returns! It is fair to assume that if they left out Irish names they also left out English and Scotch and German and Swedish names, and that the errors would neutralize themselves.

But there is another check on the 1790 population of South Irish origin. Most of the South Irish were then, as they are now, Catholics. Cardinal Gibbons, who wrote the article on the Roman Catholic Church in America in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, states:

There were then (in 1790) about 24,500 Catholics in the land, of which number 15,800 were in Maryland, and 7,000 in Pennsylvania, 200 in Virginia and 1,500 in New York.⁷

Peter Guilday, Professor of American Church History in the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., who wrote the article for the thirteenth edition, states:

The statistics generally accepted by Catholic writers based upon the estimates made by John Gilmary Shea in 1891 are as follows:

1790

40,000.⁸

The figures for the Catholic population vary, then, from 24,500 to 40,000. Many of these were English and German Catholics. Cardinal Gibbons thought

⁷ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th Ed., Vol. XXIII, p. 499.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 13th Ed., Vol. III, p. 370.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

that 15,800 out of 24,500 were in Maryland, where there were many English Catholics.

We must not forget that the colonists had strong prejudices against Catholics. There were stringent laws curtailing their civil rights and even restricting their entrance. This was true even in Maryland which was founded by Catholics. John Gilmary Shea, in his *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, states that in 1716, for example, a tax of 20 shillings was imposed "on every 'Irish papist' servant introduced into the province, and this tax was doubled the next year." This act was followed "by the complete disfranchisement of the Catholics."⁹

In 1700 the New York Legislature passed an act denouncing every Catholic priest as "an incendiary and disturber of the public peace and safety, and an enemy to the true Christian religion," and the next year a law was passed preventing Catholics from voting for members of the assembly or any office whatsoever.¹⁰

Massachusetts passed a similar act in 1700.

Mr. Shea continues:

In the Carolinas and Georgia Catholicity was practically unknown, for though a statement is printed of a Catholic settlement in North Carolina, it seems evidently fictitious, nothing being found to support it.

New England was, of course, closed to the Church. . . .

Even in the days of James II., when the city of Boston gave the Catholic governor of New York and a Jesuit Father an escort of honor, few Catholics entered New England. . . .¹¹

⁹ Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, Vol. I, p. 373, 1886.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 357.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 396.

CONCLUSION

The testimony could be continued at great length, but it is too overwhelming to doubt that all through the colonial period and down to 1790 the Catholics were a very small minority of our population. Yet, though the estimate by Catholics of the Catholic population in 1790 is only from 24,500 to 40,000, the estimate of the Irish population in 1790, which was largely Catholic, is 61,534. It would seem that the estimate is quite liberal.

The objections of the Germans, so far as they reflect merely alien prejudices, have been already considered in Chapter X. Their statistical objection is the usual one that the surnames of 1790 are a wholly worthless test. But as Dr. Joseph A. Hill of the Census Bureau, who prepared the estimates for the Presidential Commission, testified before the House Committee: "I might say that the impression that it was based on surnames only was not quite correct. They used the given name as well as the surname." They studied tour-histories, geneologies and nomenclature. He went on to say that the study of the 1790 census was made by some very competent clerks who were "extremely conscientious. . . . There was nothing of prejudice about it, it was absolutely impartial. . . ." He added that material increases in the German, Irish and Swedish groups in 1790 would not make "a very great difference" in the computation of those racial groups at the present time.

In fact, if the estimate of the South Irish in 1790 were actually doubled, the increase in the present population of South Irish origin would be only

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

766,000, which would increase the Irish quota but 1,275. If the estimate of Germans in 1790 were increased from 176,000 to 276,000, the present German origin population would be increased only 1,300,000 and the German quota increased but 2,140; that is, from 23,428 to 25,568.

It is impossible to assume that there were as many Irish omitted or with non-Irish names as there were recorded with Irish names, or that sixty percent of the Germans changed their names into un-recognizable English names or were omitted. Indeed, the name-changing argument cuts both ways for men do not change their names where their nationality is numerically strong. In places where those of German names are strong to-day, they generally retain their names, although the name-changing tendency is much stronger to-day than a century and a half ago. But we see that assuming 100% error in the Irish computation and sixty percent error in the German, the quotas would increase only 1275 and 2163 respectively. The refusal to accept the 1790 study as a base for quotas in the face of such facts can be due only to a desire to refuse to count the native stock at all in fixing quotas.

It must be remembered, too, that the British element has already been sharply reduced by the reduction of the estimate of the present strength of the 1790 stock made by the Presidential Commission. As we have seen, the Presidential Commission finds that the 1790 stock is now only 41,288,570, whereas the Census Bureau in its 1922 report gave the num-

CONCLUSION

ber as 47,330,000. The result has been to reduce the British element by over 5,000,000.

Moreover, Dr. Hill said that the census of 1790 was probably more carefully taken than that of 1920, as the population was smaller, communities were smaller, populations were not mixed nor congested and the census-takers would be more apt to take their time than they are in the hurried conditions of to-day.

It is notorious that the states wherein the population in 1790 was most mixed were the states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania and New York. Yet we find that the study of the 1790 census shows that the population was most mixed in those states. It gives 16% Dutch in New York, 12.7% Dutch in New Jersey, 9.2% German in New Jersey and 26.1% German in Pennsylvania where the Pennsylvania Germans lived.

No one has claimed that the study of the 1790 census can give exact estimates of national origins, but all the experts who have studied the question have come to the conclusion that the 1909 study of the population is approximately correct. It is chiefly the alien blocs who scout its findings.

The study of names in 1790, while obviously not a positive test, is certainly infinitely closer to the facts than the boasts of various interested alien groups. And, above all, it forms an immeasurably better basis for the estimate of our present population than any foreign-born basis. Quotas based on the 1920 census of foreign-born are arbitrary because they admit aliens on the basis of the most recent immigration.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

On the 1920 foreign-born basis, 52% of our immigration would come from southeastern Europe whereas no one asserts that 52% of our population originated in southeastern Europe. The 1924 Act now admits immigrants on the basis of the 1890 census. But the 1890 census of foreign-born represents neither the present foreign-born nor the national origins. On that basis our immigration in 1927 is determined by about 8,000,000 in 1890 born outside of North and South America, many of whom were not naturalized and some of whom may have returned to their native countries. Of our white population in 1890, the native-born had no representation whatever in fixing the quotas. Of our 1920 population, only those of the 8,000,000 foreign-born in 1890 who are still alive have any representation in the quota. The entire native stock, except those who are children of the 8,000,000, are left out of the count. The 1890 basis was adopted in 1924 for the sole reason that it comes closer to the actual content of the country than the 1920 foreign-born basis. But no one pretends that it is even an approximation of the actual content. Its figures may be accurate, but its theory is totally arbitrary. The national origins figures may be estimated, but the theory is not arbitrary.

One Congressman said last winter that the origins basis erects the 1790 stock into a sacred class. Nothing could be more mistaken. The origins plan merely counts the 1790 stock. The 1890 basis, on the other hand, does create a sacred class. It allows the 1890 foreign-born, 8,000,000 people thirty-seven

CONCLUSION

years ago, to determine all our quotas. The native-born, all the foreign-born that have come in since 1890, are not counted.

We saw that Rabbi Wise and other of the South Europeans cried out that the 1924 law was an insult to the South European, that it went back to a census thirty-seven years ago solely in order to cut down the number of South Europeans. If the 1890 basis is continued, the protest will be justified. It was adopted as a temporary measure simply because it was closer to the actual content of our population than 1910 or 1920. But it does not represent the entire country, it does not represent the foreign-born to-day, and if it is continued, it will be indeed an insult not only to the foreign-born who have come in since 1890 but to the entire native stock. But no one can be offended by the origins basis. It is fair to all because it counts all. If it is maintained, the cry of insult will stop.

Those with an anti-British complex would discriminate against immigration from Great Britain. But those without the complex should be willing to admit that in these days, when our unity is already seriously threatened, if we are to take any immigration at all it is the sheerest common sense to say that 48% of our immigration should come from the countries that gave us 48% of our population, and our law, our language and our political institutions. The British immigrants will come to us knowing our language, understanding our legal system, and long steeped in the practice of representative government.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

They are so like us that they have never formed a hyphenated group. While we have had appeals to a Swedish, an Irish, a German and an Italian vote, we have never had an appeal to an English or a Scotch vote. This is a crude but very effective test of hyphenism. The origins system, therefore, increases the chance of maintaining at least 50% of our population as a homogeneous stock.

5. THE ALTERNATIVE

But let us consider what would happen if we reject the national origins basis. Serious objection has been made that the national origins basis will increase immigration from Southeastern Europe. As we get farther and farther away from 1890 it will be harder and harder to defend the 1890 basis. The pressure will become stronger and stronger to bring the quotas down to the last foreign-born figures at the last census. On that basis all southeastern Europe will gain. Immigration will favor our minority groups. The national origins provision of the 1924 law provides that under it immigration shall be limited to 150,000. The total foreign-born according to the 1920 census subject to the quota is about 12,000,000. Two percent of the foreign born from each country is allowed to come under the 1890 basis. Two percent of 12,000,000 is 240,000. But as the limit is 150,000, to compare the origins systems with the 1920 foreign-born basis I have taken two percent of the foreign-born from each country in 1920 and reduced it to five-eighths thereof.

CONCLUSION

In making these estimates for the 1920 foreign-born basis it has been necessary to use the 1920 census figures of foreign-born for the various quota countries. These do not always coincide with the figures of the persons born in the countries as now constituted. The boundaries have been changed since 1920 in several instances. In the case of the division between North Ireland and the Free State, it has been possible to make the separation on the same basis as the government made it for the 1890 basis, namely, on the basis that 76% of those born in Ireland were

	Presi- dential Commis- sion's Quotas	1920 Foreign Born Quotas
Northwest Europe		
Belgium.....	410	778
Denmark.....	1,044	2,351
France.....	3,837	1,903
Germany.....	23,428	20,964
Great Britain and North Ireland....	73,039	17,213
Iceland.....	100	100
Irish Free State....	13,862	9,801
Luxemburg.....	100	156
Netherlands.....	2,421	1,638
Norway.....	2,267	4,524
Sweden.....	3,259	7,777
Switzerland.....	1,198	1,475
	124,965	81.38% 68,680 44.95%
	[401]	

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

	Presi- dential Commis- sion's Quotas		1920 Foreign- Born Quotas	
Southeast Europe				
Albania.....	100		100	
Andorra.....	100		100	
Austria.....	1,486		7,157	
Bulgaria.....	100		130	
Czecho-Slovakia....	2,248		4,506	
Danzig.....	122		100	
Esthonia.....	109		100	
Finland.....	559		1,862	
Greece.....	367		2,187	
Hungary.....	967		4,939	
Italy.....	6,091		20,019	
Jugoslavia.....	777		2,116	
Latvia.....	184		100	
Liechtenstein.....	100		100	
Lithuania.....	494		1,679	
Monaco.....	100		100	
Poland.....	4,978		14,174	
Portugal.....	290		869	
Roumania.....	516		1,278	
Russia.....	4,781		17,413	
San Marino.....	100		100	
Spain.....	674		615	
	25,243	16.44%	79,744	52.20%
Asia.....	1,633	1.06%	2,603	1.70%
Australasia.....	500	.32%	536	.35%
Africa.....	1,200	.78%	1,200	.78%
GRAND TOTALS.....	153,541		152,763	
	[402]			

CONCLUSION

born in South Ireland. But in other cases the divisions between countries are not available. With this explanation, I give in the table above the numbers which each country could send on the 1920 foreign-born basis as contrasted with what it could send on the Commission's origins basis.

We see then that Great Britain could send almost 56,000 more on the origins basis than on the 1920 basis; the Irish Free State, 4,000 more; Germany, 2,500 more; Holland, 800 more. On the other hand, Italy could send 14,000 more on the 1920 basis; Austria, 5,700 more; Russia, almost 13,000 more; Poland, 9,200 more. The percentage from Northwest Europe under the origins plan is 81.38%. Under the 1920 basis it would be 44.95%. The loss to Northwest Europe would be 36.43%, or 56,315. The increase in Southeast European immigration would be 35.8%, or 54,499. If then, as is reasonably certain if we stick to the foreign-born basis, we shall go eventually onto the 1920 foreign-born basis, we shall lose 56,315 from Northwest Europe and acquire 54,999 from Southeast Europe.

On the other hand, the loss of immigration from Northwest Europe under the origins plan as opposed to the 1890 basis is negligible. On the 1890 basis, 85.6% of our immigration could come from Northwest Europe; on the origins 81.38%, and on Captain Trevor's basis 83.55%. The loss from the 1890 basis is only 4.22% under the Presidential Commission's basis or 2.05% under Captain Trevor's estimates. These percentages applied against the total

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

quota immigration allowed by the Presidential Commission, 153,541, give amounts of only 6,479 and 3,147, respectively. The only appreciable change is distribution within the groups from Northwest Europe. The Irish and Germans would lose rather heavily, the Danes, Swedes and Norwegians slightly, and the British would gain heavily.

Moreover, the origins basis, once adopted, can be maintained steadily. The estimates of origins can be revised every ten years to accord with the last census figures.

If the foreign-born of the latest census is adopted as the basis, the whole quota system is thrown in jeopardy. It will then benefit only the minority of our population—the newer immigration from South-eastern Europe. This population is not in sympathy with the quota system and the plan is bound to lose strength when those who support it are no longer benefited by it.

Last February the whole question was postponed for a year. The issue, then, is joined. It is an issue vital to America's future. It is greatly to be hoped that Congress will have courage and statesmanship enough to maintain the origins principle, for I earnestly believe that it contains the life principle of immigration restriction. The quota legislation has been an outstanding piece of American statesmanship. In these days when it is the fashion to decry our Senators and Congressmen, and, alas! we have had much cause to do so, it is a matter of the greatest pride that Congress had had the vision and the

CONCLUSION

courage to enact the Quota Law. Restriction by quota was a brilliant conception, but the conception of restriction by origins was little less than a stroke of genius. Restriction by quota will be the means of saving us from racial heterogeneity and confusion. But the origins system is essential to the maintenance of the quota system. Let us pray that it will be maintained!

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I insist again that I make no invidious comparisons of the colonial stock with the later immigrants. Time and again in this book I have pointed this out, but it will do no harm to do so again as I close. The chief stock in trade of many opponents of restriction is that its advocates are afflicted with a superiority complex. I do not deny that the colonial stock has produced its bosses and political failures. I do not deny the intolerance and provincialism of a large part of the old stock. It is true that its faults have been greatly exaggerated by the immigrants and their friends who of recent years have exulted in pouring ridicule on the native stock, while ignoring the failures of the immigrants. But the faults of the colonial stock are only such human faults as the English, the French, or any other native stock will possess. If we are to admit immigrants so long as the colonial stock is subject to the imperfections with which they are taunted, of course, we shall admit immigrants forever, for perfection is not immanent with any of the human race. On the other

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

hand, the immigrants surely have all our human faults and in addition they are different and burden us with the crucial fact of that difference.

Nor do I think that our old political tradition, our political institutions, are sacrosanct, that we cannot learn better ways, new ideas, that we cannot be enriched by new and varying cultures. We have much to learn. There is much that we can acquire with profit. But the old tree is sound and beautiful yet. New branches can be grafted on it, but it were folly to cut it down, or to let it decay. New political institutions and new ways can be incorporated in our structure, but the old structure should remain the base.

Like-mindedness and common traditions will not entail a dull uniformity, the suppression of all variety and originality. The England of Elizabeth was coherent and yet it flowered with amazing beauty and diversity of expression. The England of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher and Marlowe, was not dull and uniform. The England of Victoria was coherent, but the country that produced Tennyson, Browning, Dickens, Thackeray, Kipling and Stevenson was not dull and uniform. The France of Louis Fourteenth was coherent but the country that produced Molière, Racine, La Fontaine, La Bruyère and La Rochefoucauld was not dull and uniform. In fact, racial diversity is more likely to breed uniformity than is like-mindedness, for when we are racially diverse it is only on a low level that we can understand each other. Diversity

CONCLUSION

of standards and background, means, in politics, the newspaper. The movie, that we must appeal to the masses on a low common denominator. Like-mindedness gives genius a chance to be understood in the bigger and deeper things as well as the obvious. Like-mindedness gives originality and variety a chance. Racial diversity stifles them.

We may profit by moderate change. Small accretions will only enrich us. Mass increases may swamp us. We can afford to take small groups as England took the Huguenots and the Flemish. We cannot afford to take immigrants as Gaul took the Franks, or as Rome took the Teutonic hordes. We may take accretions as a river takes in the brooks and rivulets along its course. But if we take immigration as the Mississippi takes in the Missouri, we will become a different nation just as the Mississippi, clear and unified above St. Louis, is a different stream after it is joined by the muddy Missouri. Its name is the same, as our name would be the same, but it is a different river, and we would be a different nation.

The essential, the crucial fact, emphasized all through this book, then, has been not the inferiority of the new immigration to the old, or to the colonial stock, but their numbers and their difference. We do not criticize them for their difference. They cannot help it. But we can criticize a fatuous and cowardly politics which will not see the tragic effects of difference when multiplied by overwhelming numbers. After all, the blame for hyphenism is less on the hyphenates than on our mad immigration policy.

AMERICA: NATION OR CONFUSION

Being different and coming in great masses, they have threatened our unity. Being different and continuing to come in great masses, they will in the end destroy our unity. The essential object we should have is to preserve our unity. All who realize that danger should agree on our object. When we are asked, therefore, by what right those who came first can exclude others, the reply can only be by the right that they have made a nation, and that the existence of that nation for them and for those who came later is threatened by disunion and diversity. The country will not be a haven or a beacon-light for native or immigrant if it is not maintained a country.





3 1002 1014 2961 0

14 DAY BOOK

Two cents daily after date due

DATE DUE

MAR 17 '47

FEB 20 '87

FEB 13 '48

AG 2 '48

AG 18 '49

DE 13 '49

MR 22 '50

NOV 27 '58

DEC 10 '58

DEC 19 '58

MAY -3 '76

NOV 8 '82

DEC 21 1985



Philip W. University

Atlanta, Georgia

JV6465

L4

LEWIS

30221

America, nation or
confusion

